
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>





THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

VOL. XXXIX

BALTIMORE: B. L. GILDERSLEEVE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, AGENTS
LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD
PARIS: ALBERT FONTENOING LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1918

L.

129004

P1
A5
v. 29



The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXIX.

No. 153.

I.— <i>Syncretism</i> in the Indo-European Dative. By WALTER PETERSEN,	1
II.—An Epigram of Philodemus and Two Latin Congeners. By G. L. HENDRICKSON,	27
III.—Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches. Part II. By H. V. CANTER,	44
IV.—Oaths in the Greek Epistolographers. By F. WARREN WRIGHT,	65
V.—Chaucer's Griselda and Homer's Arete. By ALBERT STAN-BURROUGH COOK,	75
VI.—New Collation of Parisinus 7900 A for the Epistles of Horace. By M. S. SLAUGHTER,	79
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	81
Leonard's <i>T. Lucretius Carus</i> .—Cummings' <i>The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio</i> .—Bloomfield's <i>An Introduction to the Study of Language</i> .	
REPORTS:	93
<i>Revue de Philologie</i> .— <i>Rivista di Filologia</i> .	
BRIEF MENTION,	99
CORRESPONDENCE,	108
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	112
BOOKS RECEIVED,	115

No. 154.

I.— <i>Syncretism</i> in the Indo-European Dative. By WALTER PETERSEN,	117
II.—Problems in Delphian Chronology. By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON,	145

III.—Comic Terminations in Aristophanes. By CHARLES W. PEPPLER,	173
IV.—The <i>To</i> -Participle with the Accusative in Latin. By CLARA M. KNIGHT,	184
V.—Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets. By W. P. MUSTARD,	193
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	199
Tavenner's Studies in Magic from Latin Literature.—Husband's The Prosecution of Jesus: Its Date, History and Legality.—Mustard's The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus.	
REPORTS:	211
<i>Revue de Philologie</i> .— <i>Hermes</i> .	
BRIEF MENTION,	220
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	224
BOOKS RECEIVED,	227
 No. 155.	
I.—The Apocryphal Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare Holograph. By ALEXANDER GREEN,	229
II.—The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy. By DONALD CLIVE STUART,	268
III.—West Germanic Preterits with <i>E</i> from IE <i>EI</i> . By EDWIN W. FAY,	291
IV.—The Compound Negative Prefix <i>an-a-</i> in Greek and Indic. By EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME,	299
V.—Omoroka and Thalathth. By PAUL HAUPT,	306
VI.—Cicero, <i>Ad Att. XV, 9, I.</i> By TENNEY FRANK,	312
VII.—Lithuanian <i>gaudone</i> 'Horse-Fly'. By HAROLD H. BENDER,	314
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	316
Sturtevant's Linguistic Change.—Wulff's <i>Den Oldjavanske Wirātaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original</i> .—Clédat's <i>Manuel de Phonétique et de Morphologie Historique du Français</i> .	
REPORTS:	326
<i>Hermes</i> .— <i>Revue de Philologie</i> .	
BRIEF MENTION,	332
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	336
BOOKS RECEIVED,	339

CONTENTS.

v

NO. 156.

I.—An ‘Inspired Message’ in the Augustan Poets. By ELIZA-BETH HAZELTON HAIGHT,	341
II.—The Date of the Vatinian Law. By EVAN T. SAGE,	367
III.— <i>Vindiciae Phaedrianae</i> . By J. P. POSTGATE,	383
IV.—The ‘Thought’ Motif of Wisdom Versus Folly in Greek Tragedy. By LARUE VAN Hook,	393
V.—On Aeneas Tacticus. By W. A. OLDFATHER and ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE,	402
VI.—On the <i>Kosrol</i> of Julius Africanus. By W. A. OLDFATHER and A. S. PEASE,	405
VII.— <i>Praevaricatio</i> and Delirium. By NORMAN W. DE WITT,	407
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	409
<i>Meillet’s Caractères généraux des Langues Germaniques.—Van-overbergh’s Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is Spoken at Bauco.</i>	
REPORTS:	421
<i>Rivista Di Filologia.—Hermes.</i>	
BRIEF MENTION,	427
CORRESPONDENCE,	434
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	436
BOOKS RECEIVED,	439
INDEX,	441

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX, I.

WHOLE NO. 153.

I.—SYNCRETISM IN THE INDO-EUROPEAN DATIVE.

A consideration of the opposing arguments in the much-discussed question whether the Indo-European dative was a grammatical or local case almost forces upon one the conclusion that decisive reasons for one or the other point of view are not to be found; for otherwise there would be some signs that a final decision is at least appreciably nearer. Instead of that, however, there is no gainsaying the fact that even now the localists as well as the adherents of the grammatical theory are able to confront their opponents with incontrovertible arguments without being able to find convincing support for their own side.

Let us consider first the attempts of the localists to derive all the actually occurring uses of the dative from the comparatively rare local use, as e. g. more recently F. Gustafsson, *De dativo Latino*, Helsingfors, 1904, has done on the basis of the Latin, and E. W. Hopkins, *Transact. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 37. 88 ff., on the basis of the Sanskrit. The method followed is necessarily this, that in the first place local force is sought in a large number of occurrences in which we should not usually suspect it, so that it appears that a by far greater proportion of actually occurring datives are local than we ordinarily think; in the second place, it is shown how the strictly non-local uses like the dative of interest can be derived from the local.

So far as the latter part of the method of proof is concerned, everyone must recognize that it has no validity stand-

ing by itself, but that it must stand or fall with the other arguments of the localists. The very same examples which are used to show how the dative of interest may be derived from the local use, i. e. the dative of direction, can also be used to show how the local uses can be derived from the dative of interest. In any sentence like the Vedic *rayim dhatta márt�aya* "give wealth to man" it is as easy to show how an original notion of interest could in this particular context give a suggestion of the direction of the giving, which might later become the dominant one and give rise to the dative of direction,¹ as it is to show how it started from the directive force and allowed the notion of interest to develop secondarily. No matter from which of the many interrelated uses of any inflectional form we may start, it is possible to derive all others from it.

The really important part of the course of reasoning of the localists consequently is that in which they attempt to show that the place idea, i. e. the directive idea, or, according to others, terminative idea, is psychologically so important in such a large number of occurrences that it will appear as *the* characteristic use of the dative, while the others are mere offshoots of the same. But right here misgivings arise. To make plausible the dominance of place ideas in a certain use of the dative it is not enough to show that it is logically possible to read such an idea into a passage. Otherwise it would be proper to find spatial notions in every occurrence of every case when the words in question refer to objects of sense; for the whole world is located in space, but we think of spatial relations only a small part of the time. If e. g. Gustafsson is right in insisting that in a sentence like the Latin *Pl. Specios Menervai donum portat* (CIL. I. 191) the dative has local force because giving or carrying to Minerva implies that the gift was going in her direction, then it would be just as correct to maintain that the genitive case originally meant *place where* because in phrases like *forem cubiculi claudere* "to close the door of the chamber" it is implied that the door is located in the chamber; it would be just as convincing to say that the accusative really designates *place where* in sen-

¹ As Wundt, *Sprachpsych*. 2. 120, puts it, the apparent local uses of the dative would be due to secondary association with a directive case. Similarly Schmalz, Lat. Gram. 371.

tences like *quis te verberavit?* "who has flogged you?" because the place of the flogging is the person affected. Not, I repeat, whether one can read the notion of place logically into a passage, but whether it was there psychologically, whether it was actually felt and attended to, that is the question which concerns us.

Now we may admit as without question that there are a number of passages in which local interpretation of the dative is not only possible, but necessary. Examples like the Vedic *yásya kṣáyāya jinvatha ṣpo janáyathā ca nah* "toward whose house (dat.), O waters, ye hurry (us) and cause us to come," *te samudrāyeva sindhavah gíro . . . irate* "toward thee (dat.) as rivers rush toward the sea (dat.) rush our songs," or like the Latin *it clamor caelo* "clamor rises toward the sky," or O. Blg. *śdāśi domovi* 'going to her home', show, indisputable datives of direction and cannot easily be interpreted as datives of the indirect object or of interest. We may further agree that these certain examples make it plausible that some of the ambiguous ones like Vedic *havyáṇ no vaha* "bring to us (dat.) the libation" or Lat. *fugitivis servis indunt compedis*¹ "they put chains on the fugitive slaves" were felt as datives of direction. We may even assent to Professor Hopkins when he affirms that a study of the Sanskrit rather than the Classical languages would show how this dative of direction is much more frequent than is ordinarily supposed. Nevertheless, when one considers the fact that all collections which are intended to show the original local nature of the dative are laboriously gathered from overwhelming masses of instances in which the dative cannot have been felt as local, so that even if we grant all the doubtful examples, yet the sum total is only a small fraction of the total occurrences of the dative, and when we consider that of the examples gathered only a very small percentage *must* be taken in the sense claimed for them, we must arrive at the conclusion that even at the very best it is a hopeless task to attempt to prove that place ideas are really an important part of the total body of uses of the case. We may read through a good many pages before striking a single local dative while non-local ones occur every few lines.

¹ Plaut. Men. I. I. 4.

As a matter of fact, however, there is no justification for the assumption that even the majority of doubtful instances was felt locally. We need only ask ourselves how we feel such datives in modern languages in order to see how groundless is the argument that in earlier times we may assume local force for a case if it is logically possible to read it into the same. Sentences like Engl. *pass me the bread, I sent him a letter, he gare her a present, he struck him a blow*, or the German constructions like *sich jemandem nähern, jemandem Schaden zufügen, jemandem etwas geben, nehmen, jemandem den Weg verlegen, jemandem etwas zuteilen, bringen, senden*, all of these and many others are felt by the speakers of the languages without the slightest reference to any spatial relations which might logically be intruded, and unless strong reasons speak against it we must here as otherwise interpret the past in the light of the present.

Nor is the supposition that similar locutions were in the past interpreted locally helped in the slightest by showing that prepositional phrases or the locative or accusative case can sometimes take the place of the dative with no essential change of meaning, as e. g. Plautus uses *ad hostis exuvias dabit* (Epid. 1. 1. 38) instead of the usual dative with *dare*, or in RV. 1. 117. 17 *ākṣī rjrāçve açvināv adhattam* "ye Açvins bestowed eyes upon Rjräçva (loc.)" contrasted with 1. 116. 16 *tāsmā akṣī . . . ādhattam* "upon him (dat.) ye bestowed eyes." When two equivalent expressions alternate in this fashion it does not follow that there was no difference felt at all, and even if so, the argument works both ways. From the substitution of the prepositional phrase or locative for the dative we may as well argue the loss of local meaning in the former as its presence in the latter, a point of view which is shown to be historically correct by the Romance datives, which arose from these very prepositional phrases, and yet are today not felt as being more local than the German dative.

Finally, the local origin of the dative case is made highly improbable by two characteristics which have often enough been pointed out by the opponents of the local theory, but which its supporters have either ignored or else treated with slight consideration. It was pointed out by Hübschmann, *Zur Casuslehre* p. 214, and later by Franz Misteli, *Zeitsch. f.*

Völkerpsych. 1886 p. 419, and C. F. W. Mueller, Glotta 2. 170, that it would be utterly unintelligible why the dative, if it really were a local case, would not, like the ablative, locative, instrumental, genitive, and accusative, be sometimes used with prepositions;¹ for the same tendency to substitute clearer and more explicit expressions of local relations for the comparatively vague case endings ought to have affected the dative, and all the more so because its local nature was so much more easily obscured than e. g. that of the ablative. It is really amazing that this almost conclusive objection should not have been taken more seriously by the localists. However, the same consideration was shown by them to the objection of Delbrück, Gr. 3. 185, that the dative is primarily a personal case, i. e. most words found in the dative designate persons, and it would not be probable that persons would be thought of as the goal of the motion.² While Fay, Class. Quart. 5. 190, considers this objection convincing, Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2². 474, declares he does not consider this fact an objection against an original local force of the dative, and Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin p. 103,³ denies the prevalence of the personal datives, affirming that it was just as much an infinitival case. It would seem, however, that while no one doubts the use of the dative of a large number of non-personal nouns, yet the prominence of the personal datives is a reality,⁴ and since this is much more easily explained by assuming a non-local origin⁵ of the dative, that it is a distinct point against the local theory, unless some one could explain by what forces this condition could have come about secondarily, and this, as far as I know, no one has even attempted.

All in all, then, the local origin of the dative meets with so many insurmountable objections that it would be strange that it could display such vitality, were it not for the fact that its

¹ It is true that rare instances of the dative with prepositions occur e. g. in Lithuanian or Slavic. This, however, does not affect the original nature of the dative, since these were secondary developments of individual languages. Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2². 781 f.

² An examination of one's consciousness in speaking phrases like Engl. 'he sent me a letter' shows how pertinent Delbrück's objection is.

³ Bennett herein follows Hopkins, JAOS. 28. 406.

⁴ H. Peine, De dativi apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu p. 7, finds scarcely one twelfth of the datives in early Latin to be non-personal.

⁵ See p. 13.

opponents had nothing to put in its place; for the statement that it was originally a grammatical case, that it designated interest from the beginning, has always justly been challenged by the localists on the ground that no element of language, be it a word or part of a word, could ever have begun with such a vague and abstract meaning. This objection is perhaps most clearly stated by Whitney, A. J. of Phil. 13. 285: "To pronounce a case originally grammatical is simply equivalent to saying that its ultimate character lies beyond our discovery; and the statement might much better have been made in the latter form. For to postulate such a value at the beginning is to deny the whole known history of language, which shows that all forms begin with something material, apprehensible by the senses, palpable (*handgreiflich*). If the intellectual values of terms are anterior to their physical; if the tense and mode uses of *have* and *will* and *would* and their like are the original ones; if *be* began with being an expression of the copula; if the *-dom* of *wisdom* and the *-wise* of *likewise* and the *-head* of *godhead* were derivative suffixes before they were independent nouns—then, and not otherwise, was a case originally grammatical. Such an explanation simply betrays a false philosophy of language." This convincing objection against the assumption of original grammatical cases Brugmann, Gr. 2², 472, also extends to Wundt's "Cases of inner determination" (*Sprachpsych.* 2. 84 ff.), which he substituted for the old "grammatical cases."

I do not believe, however, that the localists, because of these valid objections against the interest theory of the dative, have a right to win by default in spite of the extremely great objections to their own. This would only be true if it were absolutely necessary to choose between the two in the form mentioned; but in actual fact it is possible to formulate a primarily non-local theory in such a way as not to run contrary to all the known principles of linguistics and psychology. This article, then, attempts to find such a theory of the dative which neither conflicts with actual usage, as that of the localists, nor with certain linguistic and psychological principles, as the grammatical theory.

To clear the ground it will be necessary first to explain my attitude to Wundt's just mentioned distinction between cases

of inner and outer determination. He considers the former such as express relations which *need* not have as their exponent any change in the form of the word, as opposed to the latter which must necessarily have them. The Nominative, Genitive, Dative, and Accusative are clear enough through the context even when their form is identical, and they are therefore cases of inner determination regardless of whether they actually are characterized formally or not. In criticism of this formulation, however, one might say that if Wundt means by cases of inner determination also those which were so from the beginning, and not merely those which became so secondarily, his division cannot stand against the objection of Whitney and Brugmann that every linguistic element must start from a sensuous concrete use. This objection, however, holds only against those cases which actually began with suffixes, so that one might better say that cases of inner determination are such as actually began without formal characterization, and in that case they are not only something psychologically intelligible, but necessary. As soon as sentences were formed at all it was an absolute necessity that the relations of subject, direct and indirect object, and attributive relationship, now expressed by these four cases, should be conveyed from speaker to hearer—not attended to and expressed, but merely suggested. A collocation like *dog bite man*, representing three uninflected primitive words, would not be a sentence unless it conveyed to the hearer that the dog did the biting and the man was bitten, that the former was subject and the latter object. Moreover, the collocation of these stems could not even fail to awake these necessary associations; for there would be no purpose in collocating these words except to convey such a piece of information. Yet these suggestions are not attached to any linguistic unit, they are something purely syntactical,¹ arising altogether from closely joining these words together. I take it then that any case being originally a case of inner determination was simply an uninflected stem which had no case meaning by itself, but which in the context with other words suggested certain fundamental relations, the perception of which is a necessary prerequisite to forming even the most

¹This possibility of apparent case-meanings being suggested by mere collocation with other words is vaguely hinted at by Brugmann, op. cit. 472.

primitive sentence, and which must therefore have existed long before the cases of outer determination with their suffixes, which according to the localists are the original ones.

Coming back to the Indo-European dative, the thesis I wish to present is that it is a case of inner determination even in this limited sense, i. e. that it was originally a case without ending or any other formal characterization, but secondarily received its endings by association with local cases, and that these local cases then in turn thrust upon the dative certain meanings like that of direction which were originally foreign to it. The dative, therefore, is the result of syncretism between an originally suffixless case of the indirect object and certain local cases from which it borrowed its endings.

That the Indo-European dative originally had no suffix, is not difficult to establish. In the plural it never did have a form of its own, but borrowed it from the ablative. That the converse of this is not true is seen from the fact that the I. E. Dat. Abl. Plur. ended in *-bhios*, *-bhos*, or *-mos*, all of which have in common the last two letters *-os*, which must have been associated with the *-os* of the gen. abl. sing. In the singular again the dative ending *-ai* seems to be the strong form of the *-i* of the locative,¹ so that it is literally true that the dative nowhere has an ending of its own. Moreover, we have remnants of datives which are the pure stem in the pronominal declension, which so often retains primitive characteristics as opposed to the nouns. I am referring to the fact that while all of the accented forms of the personal pronouns of the different I. E. languages vary so much from each other that we may conclude that the Indo-European parent language had not yet developed any such forms,² the enclitic forms on the other hand, which certainly do go back to the parent language,³ generally do service for two or more cases, and

¹Cf. Hirt, *Handbuch der gr. Laut- und Formenlehre* p. 308.

²Cf., e. g., Meillet, *Introduct.* 317.

³It is not at all necessary to assume, or even probable, that these 'enclitic' forms were always enclitic from the beginning. Much more probably they were the only I. E. forms, and their being retained only when enclitic is due to the lesser importance of distinguishing case-relations for unemphasized elements of speech. That is to say, the development of pronominal forms which differ in form for the dif-

particularly the dative is always without case-suffix. The Skt. *nas*, Acc. Dat. Gen. Pl. of the pronoun of the first person, and *vas*, Acc. Dat. Gen. Pl. of the second person, which are the representatives of I. E. *nōs* and *vōs* in the same functions, certainly are without case suffix, even though their *-s* is probably a plural sign. The corresponding Skt. duals *naṁ* and *vāṁ*, though the former may have a dual ending, are also not distinguished by any case endings, and yet do service for the same three cases. In the singular again the enclitic forms I. E. **moi*, Skt. *me* Gr. *μοι*, I. E. **toi* Skt. *te* Gr. *τοι* (*σοι*), and I. E. **soi* Prakr. *se* Av. *hē ūē* Gr. *οι*, of the first, second, and third persons respectively, function both as genitives and datives; and while they seem to be locatives in origin, yet as far as the dative is concerned, they also show that it need have and originally did have no formal characterization, and the usurpation of the locative form reminds one of the regular nominal dative singular. Turning to the Germanic languages, we find that the pronouns very rarely show any distinction in the dual and plural between dative and accusative. Goth. *ugkis*, O. Icel. *ok(k)r*, and O. Engl. *unc* were dative as well as accusative of the first person dual; Goth. *iqqis*, O. Icel. *yk(k)r*, and O. Engl. *inc* of the second dual; Goth. *uns unsis*, O. Icel. *oss*, and O. Engl. *ús* of the first plural; and Goth. *izwis*, O. Icel. *yrr*, and O. Engl. *éow* of the second plural. The Old High German, on the other hand, did usually distinguish between the two cases,¹ but it was of so little importance to maintain the distinction that the modern German has dropped it again, so that *uns*, *euch*, and *sich* are both dative and accusative. All of this shows how unimportant it is to distinguish formally between the case of the direct and the indirect object, and how plausible it is in the light of the behaviour of the pronouns with their general archaic tendencies, that the nominal dative was also in the beginning a case without formal characterization.

What must have been the earliest functions of this primitive dative without ending has already been indicated by

ferent cases, as it took place in the individual languages, fulfilled a real need only when there was emphasis on the pronouns, whereas the case relations were usually indifferent when unemphasized.

¹Cf. Braune, Ahd. Gram.² 203.

calling it the case of the indirect object. And the term "indirect object," in order to have a real meaning, must have a relative meaning; it must be taken as being in opposition to a direct object used with it at one and the same time; i. e. it must be a secondary object and not one which stands by itself. It is true that in the historic periods many a verb which takes only one object has the dative, while many others have the accusative, and then we help ourselves by saying that the accusative designates the object which is directly and immediately affected, while the dative is used where the object is only remotely affected,¹ and that is why e. g. verbs of obeying take the dative in most languages, while one like striking, which affects the object physically, takes the accusative. It does not take much testing of the actual facts, however, to see that the dative or accusative is used quite mechanically without feeling a consistent difference. Thus, in the case of verbs of giving, the person to whom a thing is given is very much more immediately affected by it than the one before whom we feel ashamed; in fact, the latter may know nothing of our feeling at all. Nevertheless, the Greek uses *αισχύνομαι* with the accusative, i. e. treats it as taking a direct object. Of a large number of such verbs which take the accusative though they do not affect their object at all intimately, I may mention the following: verbs meaning 'to fear', e. g. Skt. *cāy-*, Gr. *φοβεῖσθαι*, Lat. *timere*, Goth. *faúrhtjan* Germ. *fürchten*; 'to know', e. g. Skt. *jñā-*, Gr. *γιγνώσκειν*, Lat. *noscere*, Goth. *kunnan*, Germ. *kennen*; 'to see', e. g. Skt. *darç-*, Gr. *όπαv*, Lat. *videre*, Goth. *saihvan*, Germ. *sehen*; 'to praise', e. g. Skt. *stu-*, Gr. *αἰνεῖν*, Lat. *laudare*, Goth. *haþjan*, Germ. *loben*. Greek furnishes particularly good examples: *δμνύvαι τoύs θeoύs* 'to swear by the gods', *μένειν τuά*² (Latin *manere aliquem*) 'to wait for one', *φεύγειν τuά* (Lat. *fugere aliquem*) 'to flee from one', *λαvθάneιν τuά* 'to escape

¹ So C. F. W. Mueller, loc. cit. 171.

² Brugmann, Gr. Gr¹. 379 f., thinks that such accusatives are caused by secondary associations with normal direct objects. No doubt such associations could take place at any and all times; but, on the other hand, it is also true that the attitude of the primitive mind to an abstraction like 'direct object' would not be less vague, but more vague than our own, so that many relations for which we now seek concise expressions were formerly satisfactorily expressed by merely placing an object (with or without case suffix) after the verb.

the notice of one', σιγᾶν, σιωπᾶν τι 'to keep silence about something'.

Contrariwise many verbs which affect the object much more intimately than any of the transitive verbs mentioned take the dative, i. e. have an 'indirect object'. Leaving out of account examples like the dative after verbs of saying or giving, where the person, though very intimately affected, is yet less so than the direct object, and confining myself to instances in which the dative is the only object, I mention the following: verbs meaning 'to help, assist', e. g. Skt. *çak-*, Gr. ἀρύειν, Lat. *opitulari*, O. H. G. *helfan*; 'to serve', e. g. Skt. *çam-*, Av. *vid-*, Gr. ὕπηρεῖν, Lat. *servire*, O. H. G. *thionōn*, O. Blg. *služiti*; 'to rule over', e. g. Gr. ἡγεῖσθαι, Lat. *moderari, imperare*, Goth. *waldan*, O. Blg. *ustojati*. Gothic¹ has particularly good instances; e. g. *biniman* 'to steal', *fraliusan drakmin* 'to lose a drachma', *galukan haúrdai* 'to close the door', *usqiman* 'to kill', *uswairpan* 'to throw out'.

Particularly instructive in this respect is the fact that different languages or synonyms of the same language so often differ, so that one has the dative where the other uses the accusative. Of the verbs meaning 'to follow' the Skt. *sac-*, Lat. *sequere*, and Goth. *laistjan* take the accusative, while Gr. ἔποιθαι² and Germ. *folgen* are followed by the dative. Verbs of speaking almost everywhere use only the dative of the person spoken to, yet the Sanskrit sometimes has the accusative, e. g. *tám devá abruvan* 'the gods spoke to him'. In the Gothic we find *gaumida mann blindamma* 'he saw a blind man' and *hausjan waúrdaim* 'to hear the words' with datives as opposed to the usual accusatives with words meaning 'to see' and 'to hear'. In fact almost any of the words mentioned above as taking a dative which affects the object immediately will serve as examples: Gr. ἀφεῖν and Lat. *iuvare* 'to help', Gr. θεραπεύειν and Lat. *colere* in the meaning 'to serve', Gr. ἄγειν, Lat. *agere*, and Germ. *föhren* 'to lead' all

¹ While Germanic examples on the whole are less satisfactory, because of the syncretism of the dative with ablative, locative, and instrumental, it seems probable that the examples here mentioned are true datives.

² Since Skt. *sac-* occasionally takes the instrumental instead of the accusative, we may suspect that the dative with *ἔποιθαι* and *folgen* partially goes back to the same case.

take accusatives, though they are synonyms of the words quoted above as taking the dative. Contrast also Latin *iubere* (acc.) and *imperare* (dat.) 'to order', Engl. *hear* and *listen to*, *address* and *speak to*, *obey* and *yield to*. Then again one and the same language varies between the dative and accusative for the very same words, so e. g. Skt. *gā-* 'to sing' and *stu-*¹ 'to praise' may put the god who is honored in either case. In Greek poetry ὠφελάν is sometimes used with the dative of the person instead of the accusative, and ἐπεοθαν with the accusative instead of the normal dative. In the Latin *adulari* 'to flatter', *aemulari* 'to emulate', *desperare* 'to despair of', *curare* 'to care about', and many others take either case without distinction. Cf. Schmalz, Lat. Gram⁴. p. 372. In German *es kostet mich eine Mark* and *es kostet mir eine Mark* are used without the slightest difference.

All of this shows that a real consistent feeling of distinction between the two cases was not at any time attained to. While it must be admitted that the dative did in course of time generally suggest an attitude that may be called interest, yet this was always far from definite, and not by any means so strong a force as the association with other words and constructions which explains all of these inconsistencies and variations. The dative or the accusative is used as the sole object of a verb simply because it has become the habit to use it, and the whole construction is mechanically reproduced in speaking without analysis.

Just so soon, however, as the dative is the secondary object and is used with an accusative direct object, there is a situation which causes attending to the difference between the two, so that the former is felt as expressing something akin to interest. But the same implication is there when both words are uninflected, for the mere collocation of the two words with the verb necessarily means that they stand in different relations to it, i. e. usually both cannot stand in the same intimate relation, and so one is the direct object, and the other the indirect. To take an English sentence like "He sold him a hat," it is merely a result of the situation that *him* is here the indirect object. With only one object "He sold him" would mean that he sold him into slavery, or if he were a base-

¹Cf. Delbrueck, Ai. Syntax 141.

ballplayer, that his services were sold to other employers, but it would still be a direct object. But when *hat* is there as another object, the absence of any conjunction as well as the absurdity of the supposition would prevent the coming up of the idea that both he and the hat were sold, and both would be interpreted with reference to one and the same action, so that the one not so immediately affected by the selling becomes the indirect object. Usually, of two objects occurring together in this fashion, one will be a person and one a thing. Now it lies in the nature of the case that when one and the same action affects both a person and a thing, that the thing will be usually more immediately affected, while the person displays a more independent attitude; and so it comes that the dative, originating as I believe from such a suffixless case of the indirect object, is a personal case to such a large extent.

Since English is now virtually an uninflected language, it will illustrate also in other ways what I consider to have been the relative nature of this primitive Indo-European dative. In the first place, our feeling as to whether an object is direct or indirect does not depend to the slightest degree on the historical nature of a construction. Where there is only one object we always feel it as direct, no matter whether it was dative or accusative when inflections were still alive. The object after *to help, trust, please, believe, command, obey, serve, resist, threaten, forgive* is invariably felt as direct object, though the German uses the dative for all of its corresponding words, and though for at least three of them the Old English also had the dative: *helpan* 'to help', *hýran* 'to obey', and *tréowan* 'to trust in'. Conversely, we feel as indirect object the personal object even when it was originally a second accusative instead of a dative: In *I ask him a question* and *he taught me grammar* the *him* and *me* are to us as truly indirect objects as in *he sold him a hat*.

Once more, then, the primitive I. E. dative must have been a case closely corresponding to the English case of the indirect object, one whose meaning was suggested altogether by the context and required the presence of a second direct object. The only difference is that in such a primitive period of language, when expression was not yet so accurate and the development of the more concise prepositional phrases had not

yet limited the sphere of such a case, its scope was incomparably larger than in English. Mere collocation of two nouns affected by the verb sufficed in an immense number of places where we desire greater clearness, and in this way arose the whole mass of datives which are used with accusatives, even when the relation to the verb is so loose that we call it a dative of advantage rather than indirect object. To the primitive mind there was no difference between the two, nor did it distinguish between an indirect object used with a direct object and an indirect object used with an accusative of effect (*he writes me a letter*) or a cognate accusative (*run me a race*).

In order to show how the actual historic uses of the dative are related to this primitive dative, I shall now tentatively classify its principal existing meanings according to whether they seem to me to have descended directly from this primitive case of the secondary or indirect object, from the locative-dative singular, the ablative dative plural, or are subsequent analogical extensions of older uses. Extensive collections of material are not aimed at. I shall give merely enough to show the probable development of the different *types*.

I. THE PRIMITIVE DATIVE OF THE SECONDARY OBJECT.

I put into this category all uses of the dative when found together with an accusative object, regardless of whether its connection with the verb is comparatively close or loose; for in either case mere collocation of the primitive uninflected form with the uninflected object or cognate accusative will suggest the relation of both substantives to the verb. The distinction mentioned, however, will appear in the subdivisions.

1. *The Dative as Secondary Object in Closer Connection with the Verb.*

The following are some of the most important verbs which take an indirect object alongside of an accusative¹ object: verbs meaning *to give*: Skt. *dā-*: RV. 10. 14. 12 *tāv asmābhyaṁ . . . pūnar dātām ásum adyéhá bhadram* 'these two shall grant us again today a happy life here'. *dhā-*: RV.

¹The dative may be a secondary object as well with a direct genitive object as with an accusative. Not to complicate the exposition I abstain from using examples of that kind, since they are interesting rather from the point of view of the genitive than the dative.

4. 12. 3 *dádhāti rátnam vidhaté* ‘he gives wealth to him who sacrifices’. Av. *dā-*: Y. 41. 1 *stutō garō ahurāi mazdāi dadə-mahi* ‘we give praise and honor to Ahuramazda’. Gr. δίδωμι: E 363 τῇ δ' ἄρις δῶκε χρυσάμπυκας ἵπποις ‘to her Ares gave the horses with golden frontlet’. Lat. *do*: Plaut. Rud. 4. 3. 22 *mihi si vis dare dimidium* ‘if you are willing to give me half’. *praebeo*: Verg. Georg. 3. 300 *capris . . . fluvios praebere re-centis* ‘to furnish fresh water to the goats’. Osc. *Anagtiiai Diitviiai dunum deded* ‘Angitiai Diae donum dedit’. Goth. *gifan*: Joh. 13. 26 पाना ह्लाफ गफ जुदिन सेमोनिस, *Skariōtau* ‘he gave the bread to Judas etc.’ O. H. G. *geban*: Tat. LXXXVII *gib mir thaz wazzar* ‘give me the water’. Lith. *dūti*: *kaili mano dūkit kažemēkui* ‘give my skin to the tanner’. O. Blg. *dati*: *dastv jims silq* ‘he gave them power’. *to offer* (to sacrifice, pour libations): Skt. आ-*labh-*: TS. 5. 1. 8. 2 *agnibhyah paçan् आ labhate* ‘to the fires he sacrifices the animals’. Av. *bar-*: V. 12. 2 *aiwyō zoaθrā baraēta* ‘he shall bring libations to the waters’. Gr. ιέρειν: ν 24 βοῦν ιέρευσ’ . . . Ζηνὶ ‘he sacrificed a bull to Zeus’. λείβω: Z 266 Διὺ λείβειν αἴθωνα ολον ‘to pour a libation of gleaming wine to Zeus’. Lat. *immolo*: Plaut. Poen. 2. 4 *dis . . . sex immolavi agnos* ‘to the gods I have sacrificed six lambs’. *libare diis dapes* (Liv. 39. 43) ‘to offer a feast to the gods’. O. Sax. *offrōn*: Ps. 65. 15 *offrān sal ik thi ohson* = Germ. *Ich werde Dir Rinder opfern*. *to consecrate*: Skt. आ-*yaj-*, cf. Delbrueck, Ai. Syntax 141. Gr. ἀγίω: Soph. O. C. 1494 θεῷ . . . βούθυτον ἐστίαν ἀγίων ‘consecrating to the god an altar for sacrificing cattle’. Lat. *consecro*: Cic. Verr. 2. 4. 29 *candelabrum . . . consecrare Jovi*. Similarly Germ. *weihen*. *to distribute*: Skt. *vi-bhaj-*: RV. 1. 123. 3 *yád adyá bhágām vibhájasi nýbhyaḥ* ‘if you today distribute to men their share’. Gr. νέμω: ζ 188 Ζεὺς δ' αὐτὸς νέμει δλθον . . . ἀνθρώποισιν ‘Zeus himself distributes wealth to men’. Lat. *distribuo*: Caes. B. G. 4. 22 *has (sc. onerarias naves) equitibus distribuit* ‘he distributed them to the horsemen’. *to sell and to lend*: Gr. πωλέω: Her. 1. 165 ἐπείτε σφι Χίοι τὰς ρήσους . . . οὐκ ἐβούλοντο ὠνευμένουσι πωλέειν ‘since to them wishing to buy the Chians were not willing to sell the islands’. δανείζω: Dem. 27. 27 τῷ Μαιράδῃ πεντακοσίας δραχμᾶς ἔδανεισεν ‘he lent D. five hundred drachmas’. Lat. *vendo*: Plaut. Ps. 1. 3. 126 *juravistin te illam nulli venditurum nisi mihi* ‘did

you promise to sell her to no one except me?' *faenero*: Plin. 2. 4. 6. 13 *sol suum lumen ceteris quoque sideribus faenerat* 'the sun lends its light also to the other stars'. Germ. *jemandem etwas verkaufen, jemandem etwas leihen*. to owe: Skt. *dhar-*: cf. Hopkins, TAPA. 37. 94. Gr. ὄφειλω: Λ 688 πολέσιν γὰρ Ἐπειοὶ χρεῖος ὄφειλον 'for the Epeans owed debts to many'. Lat. *debeo*: Cic. Fam. 13. 56 *Mylasis et Alabandis pecuniam Cluvio debent*. Germ. *jemandem etwas schulden*. to begrudge, envy, and their opposites: Av. *rā-*: Y. 28. 8 yaēibyasčā *it̄ rār̄harshōi* 'und wem du es sonst gönnen wirst'. Lat. *in-video*: Verg. Aen. 8. 508 *mihi . . . senectus invidet imperium* 'old age begrudges me the dominion'. Germ. *jemandem etwas gönnen oder misgönnen*. to take away, deprive:¹ Skt. *prá-muś*: RV. I. 24 II *mā na² ḫyuh prá mośih* 'do not take away for us our lives'. Gr. ἀφαιρέω: § 455 στὸν μὲν σφιν ἀφείλε Μεσαύλιος 'M. took away for them the food'. Lat. *eripio*: Plaut. Mil. 3. 2. 2 *eripiām ego hodie concubinam militi* 'I will today snatch away for the soldier his concubine'. Goth. *afslagan*: Marc. 14. 47 *afslög imma ausō* 'he struck off for him (his) ear'. O. Sax. *biniman*: Hel. 5498 *endi im is giwādi bindmun* = Germ. *Und sie nahmen ihm seine Kleidung*. to forgive, pardon: Skt. *crath-*: RV. I. 24. 14 *asmābhyaṁ . . . énānsi qīcrathah kṛtāni* 'pardon (lit. 'loosen') us the sins committed'. áva-sarj-: RV. 7. 86. 5 *áva drugdhāni pītrya srjā nah* 'forgive us the misdeeds of our fathers'. Gr. συγγνώσκω: Eur. And. 840 *συγγνώσεται σοι τὴν δ' ἀμαρτίαν πόσις* 'your husband will pardon you this offence'. Lat. *ignosco*: Cic. Att. I. 1. 4 *abs te peto ut mihi hoc ignoscas* 'I ask of you that you pardon me this'. Goth. *aflētan*: Matth. 6. 14 *jabai aflētip mannam missadēdins izē* 'if you forgive men their sins'. O. H. G. *bilazzan*: Ot. 2. 21. 35 *sculd bilāz uns allēn* 'forgive us all our debts'. Lith. *atléisti*: Matth. 6. 11 *atléisk mūms mūsu kaltēs* 'forgive us our sins'. Similarly O. Blg. *ostaviti*: Zogr. Luc. 11. 4 *ostavi namž gréchy naše*.

¹ The dative with verbs of depriving may have been influenced by the opposites meaning 'to give' and the like, as is maintained by Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2². 483; nevertheless from our point of view the dative is here just as near to the use of the primitive dative as anywhere else.

² The position of the enclitic will prevent its being taken as a genitive with the following word rather than a dative.

To say, tell: Skt. *vac-*: RV. 5. 1. 12 *ávocāma kavāye . . . vácah* 'we said a word to the seer'. *vad-*: RV. 2. 39. 6 *óṣṭhāv iva mádhv ásné vágantā* 'like lips speaking honey to the mouth'. Av. *səh-*: Y. 44. 9 *kabā mōi paitiša sah'yāt asištiš* 'whether the Lord will give (make known) to me promises'. Gr. *εἰπον*: 1 355 *καὶ μοι τοὺς οὐνόμα εἰπέ* 'and tell me your name'. *ἐννέπω*: a 1 *ἄνδρα μοι ἐννέπε* 'tell me (about) the man'. Lat. *dico*: Tib. 1. 3. 32 *tibi dicere laudes* 'to tell you praises' i. e. 'to praise you'. *nuntio*: Plaut. Am. 1. 1. 43 *ut haec nuntiem uxori suae* 'that I may relate this to his wife'. Goth. *qipan*: Marc. 1 44 *saiₙ ei mannhun ni qipais waiht* 'see to it that you do not tell anybody anything'. O. H. G. *sagēn*: Ot. 2. 12, 15 *ih sagēn thir . . . racha seltsāna* 'I will tell you a strange thing'. Lith. *pasakýti*: Jurk.¹ 100 *jei mótyna tēsq pasāki* 'her mother told her the truth'. O. Blg. *rešti*: Zogr. Luc. 6. 39 *reče že pritčq jims* 'he told them a parable'. *to command*: Skt. *brū-* (usually 'speak'): RV. 1. 161. 2 *ékam camasám catúrah kr̄notana tād vo devā abruvan* "make one cup into four," that the gods have commanded you'. Gr. *ἐπιτέλλω*: ψ 349 *ἀλόχῳ δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἐτέλλειν* 'he enjoined a command upon his wife'. Lat. *impero*: Caes. B. G. 4 22 *magnum eis numerum obsidum imperat* 'he enjoined upon them a large number of hostages'. Germ. *jemandem etwas befehlen*. *to promise and to prophesy*: Av. *mraž-*: Y. 32. 12 *aēibyo mazdā akā mraot* 'M. foretold them evil'. Gr. *ἱπισχνέομαι*: I 263 *ὅσσα τοι . . . ἵπισχητο δῶρα* 'what gifts he promised you'. *μαρτύρουμαι*: T 420 *τί μοι θάνατον μαρτύρειν*: 'why do you foretell death to me?' Lat. *polliceor*: Cic. Imp. Pomp. 24 69 *id omne . . . tibi et populo Romano polliceor* 'all this I promise you and the Roman people'. *praedico*: Verg. Aen. 3. 713 *hos mihi praedixit luctus* 'he prophesied me these sorrows'. Goth. *faúraqipan*: Gal. 5. 21 *patei faúraqipa izwis* 'what I foretell you'. O. Sax. *gihētan*: Hel. 1388 *gihēt im hebanriki* 'he promised them the kingdom of heaven'. Lith. *pažadéti*: Jurk. 75 *pažadéje jémdvēm giaràs dēnàs* 'he promised them a good time' (lit. 'good days'). *to answer*: Skt. *prati-pad-*: Ch. Up. 5. 11.

¹ The abbreviation Jurk. refers to Jurkschat, Litauische Märchen und Erzählungen, Heidelberg, 1898. I have retained the peculiarities of spelling there found, except that I have substituted ē and ü for ie and eo.

3 tebhyo na sarvam iva pratipatsye 'I shall not answer them everything'. Lat. *respondeo*: Plaut. Most. 5. 1. 76 *aliud ergo nunc tibi respondeo* 'I therefore answer you something else'. Goth. *andhafjan*: Matth. 27. 14 *ni andhōf imma wipra ni ainhun waúrdē* 'he answered him not a word'. Germ. *beantworte mir diese Frage. to complain of*: Skt. *garh-*: RV. 4. 3. 5 *kathā ha tād várundā . . . garhase* 'how do you complain of that to Varuna?' Av. *garəz-*: Y. 32. 9 *tā uxdā yūš-maiybā gərəzē* 'these words I complain to you'. Gr. *ἀνακλαίομαι*: Soph. Phil. 938 *ὑμῖν τάδ' . . . ἀνακλαίομαι* 'to you I complain (of) this'. Germ. *jemandem sein Leid klagen. to sing*: Skt. *arc-*: RV. 5. 30. 6 *tūbhýéd . . . árcanty arkám* 'to thee they sing the song'. Gr. *ἐπαείδω*: Xen. Mem. 2. 6. 11 *ἄ μὲν αἱ Σειρῆνες ἐπήδον τῷ Ὄδυσσοι* 'what (incantations) the Sirens sang to Odysseus'. Lat. *cano*: Ambr. Hym. 24. 12 *tibi . . . ymnūm . . . canimus* 'we sing praise unto thee'. Verg. Aen. 2. 124 *mihi iam multi crudele caneabant artificis scelus* 'many already sung (foretold) to me the cruelty of the subtle schemer'. O. H. G. *singan*: H. 24. 12 *thir . . . lob . . . singemēs* 'we sing praise unto thee'. *to write*:¹ Gr. *γράφω*: *γράψον μοι ἐπιστόλιον*² 'write me a little letter'. Lat. *scribo*: Cic. Att. 4. 4 *quod tibi . . . scribeberem* 'what I might write to you'. Goth. *mēljan*: I. Tim. 3. 14 *pata þus mēlja* 'this I write to you'. Lith. *paraszýti*: Marc. 10. 5 *jis jūms tāq prisākymq parāszē* 'he wrote you this commandment'. *to teach*:³ Skt. *vi-brū-*: RV. 1. 145. 5 *vy abravid vayúnā mártebhyo 'gnih* 'Agni taught to mortals wonderful things'. Lat. *praecipio*: Plaut. Trin. 2. 2. 17 *moribus vivito antiquis, quae ego tibi praecipio, ea facito* 'live according to the ancient customs, what I teach you, that do'. O. Sax. *lērian*: Hel. 2171 *lērda . . . godes willeon gumun* 'taught God's will to men'. *to show*: Skt. *samanu-diç-*:

¹ These datives of course do not go back to I. E. times, since writing was a later accomplishment.

² From a papyrus of the second century A. D., edited by Viereck in the Berliner Griechische Urkunden 2. 84 f.

³ I consider the dative of the person as a more primitive construction than the regular second accusative. The latter evidently arose by mechanically combining the constructions *διδάσκειν τι* and *διδάσκειν τινά*, which became possible only after the difference between direct and indirect object was no longer altogether a relative matter, i. e. after the development of a formal distinction between the dative and the accusative.

AB. 2. 7. 12 *çamitṛbhyaç caivainat tan nigrabhītṛbhyaç ca samanudicati* 'he points it out to those who slay and hold down (the victim)'. Gr. δείκνυμι: N 244 δεικνύς σῆμα βροτοῖσιν showing a sign (of the lightning) to men'. Lat. *monstro*: Enn. ap. Cic. Div. I. 58. 132 *alteri monstrant viam* 'show the way to another'. Goth. *taiknjan*: Marc. 14. 15 *sa izwis taikneip kēlikn mikilata* 'he will show you a large upper room'. O. Sax. *wisian*: Hel. 1871 *the im te hebanrikea thena weg wisit* 'who shows them the way to the kingdom of heaven'. Lith. *paródyti*: Marc. 14. 15 *jis paródys jùm didele svetlýca* as in Goth. O. Blg. *pokazati*: Zogr. Luc. 5. 14 *pokaži se ierěovi* 'show yourself to the priest'.

To stretch out, raise: Skt. *tan-*: RV. I. 115. 4 *rātri vāstras tanute simásmai*¹ 'night stretches out her dress to all'. *prásarj-*: RV. 4. 53. 4 *prásrāg bāhū bhūvanasya prajābhyaḥ* 'he stretched out his arms to the generations of the world'. Gr. ἀνέχω: Γ 318 θεοῖσι δὲ χειρας ἀνέσχον 'they lifted up (in prayer) their hands to the gods'. Lat. *tendo*: Caes. B. G. 7. 48 *Romanis de muro manus tendebant* 'to the Romans from the wall they stretched out their hands'. *to bring, carry*: Skt. *bhar-*: RV. 5. I. 10 *tūbhyaṁ bharanti kṣitáyo . . . balim* 'to you men bring tribute'. *vah-*: RV. I. 124. 12 *amā saté vahasi bhātri vāmám* 'to him being at home you bring much wealth'. Av. čim *haxa hašē baraiti* 'what does the friend bring to the friend?' Gr. φέρω: μ 63 ἀμφροσίην Δὺ πατρὶ φέροντι 'they (the doves) bring ambrosia to Zeus'. Lat. *fero*: Plaut. Am. 2. 2. 86 *osculum tetuli tibi* 'I brought you a kiss'. Goth. *atbairan*: Marc. 12. 15 *atbairip mis skatt* 'bring me the denarius'. O. H. G. *bringan*: Ot. I. 5. 4 *brāht er therera werolti diuri drunti* 'he brought to this world precious tidings'. Lith. *parnészti*: Jurk. 85 *asz tau pařneszu nórás rastinj* 'I bring you at least a foundling'. O. Blg. *nesti*: Mar. Matth. 14. 11 *nese (glavq) materi svojeji* 'she brought (the head) to her mother'. *to send*: Skt. *prá-hi-*: RV. 10. 16. 1 *áthem enam prá hinutat pitṛbhyaḥ* 'then send him (the soul of the departed) forth to his fathers'. Gr. πέμπω: λ 634 μή μοι Γοργεῖν κεφαλὴ . . . έξ Αἰδος πέμψειν 'lest she (Persephone) might send me the head of Gorgo from Hades'. ἵημι: λ 6 ἥμην δ' . . . ἵκμενον οὐρον ἵει 'sent us a favorable breeze'. προϊάπτω: Α 3 ψυχὰς Αἴδη προ-

¹ This word is here taken as a neuter, not masculine.

after 'sent the souls to Hades'. Lat. *mitto*: Caes. B. G. I. 18 *quem . . . Caesari Haedui miserant* 'which (i. e. the cavalry) the Haedui had sent Caesar'. Goth. *insandjan*: Joh. 15. 26 *panei ik insandja izwis* 'whom I shall send you'. O. Engl. *sendan*: Beow. 471 *sende ic Wylfingum . . . ealde mādmas* 'I send the W. old treasures'. Lith. *kād mān úrdeli siuntē* 'if he should send me the order'. *to throw*: Skt. *as-*: RV. 3. 30. 17 *brahmadvise tāpusīm hetim asya* 'hurl upon the hater of the brahma the glowing arrow'. *prá-har-*: TS. 5. I. 6. 4 *vájram bhrātrvadya prá harati* 'he hurls the bolt against the enemy'. Gr. *προβάλλω*: Ar. Plut. 798 *τρωγάλια τοῖς θεωμένοις προβαλόντ* 'throwing fruit to the spectators'. ἐπιπροέμενος: Δ 94 Μενελάῳ ἐπιπροέμεν ταχὸν ίόν 'to shoot toward Menelaus the swift arrow'. Lat. *iaculor*: Verg. Aen. 2. 276 *iaculatus puppis*¹ *ignis* 'hurling fire to (upon) the sterns'. Lith. *smōgū*: Jurk. 71 *čakis jam smāge tq žōdī* 'he hurls into his face (lit. him into the face) the word'.

The three or four categories of which examples have been given by no means exhaust the possible combinations in which the mere collocation of a secondary or indirect object with a direct object or internal object would suggest those notions which are now attributed to the dative case. Leaving out of account the extremely numerous words which are either synonyms of the categories mentioned, or express different shades of the same ideas, there are others which do not really belong to them and yet may have been influenced by them, though even then we cannot be sure of the priority of one over the other, since both would take the indirect object with equal right. Thus Skt. *su-* 'to press' takes the dative e. g. RV. I. 99 *Jātāvedase sunavāma sómam* 'let us press soma to J.'; and this possibly is due to association with expressions like *indrāya sómam . . . juhota* 'pour out (a libation) of soma to Indra', an example of the common dative after verbs meaning 'to offer'. In the same way the dative after 'to cause, create', unless it be considered a dative of interest, can be taken as due to the analogy of 'to give'. Cf. RV. I. 92. 17 *jyótir jándya cakráthuh* 'caused man (i. e. created for man) light'. More remote would be the possibility of Engl. *do me*

¹ The fact that the dative is here a thing makes it appear to approach the directive sense. Cf. p. 23.

a favor Germ. *tue mir den Gefallen* having been felt as similar to sentences with verbs of giving. On the other hand, verbs meaning 'to pray' may be considered as verbs of saying, whence the dative, e. g. in Gr. πολλὰ δ' . . . ἤραθ' ὁ γεράσης Απόλλων (A 36) 'much the old man prayed to Apollo'. Similarly those meaning 'to swear', which have the dative as secondary object, e. g. in Gr. νῦν μοι ὅμοσσον . . . καρτερὸν ὄρκον (T 108) 'now swear me a mighty oath', Lat. *iurare alicui aliquid* (as Stat. Th. 4. 396) 'to vow something to somebody', or Germ. *jemandem einen Eid schwören*. Words meaning 'to prohibit' may take a dative either because associated with verbs of speaking in general, as Gr. ἀπειπεῖν τινί τι (Ar. Pol. 2. 5. 19): εἶπον 'I said', and Lat. *interdicere alicui aliquid* (e. g. Liv. 34. 7): *dico*, or else through the influence of the opposite, 'to command', as in Germ. *jemandem etwas verbieten*, just like *gebieten*. Since, however, such similarities, as was remarked above, do not necessarily show us the real historic connection, inasmuch as any one of such combinations is derived equally well from the primitive case of the secondary object, I will simply mention others without attempting to trace such connections.

Common to several languages is the dative with 'to believe': Gr. πείθομαι: Plat. Apol. 25 E ταῦτα ἔγώ σοι οὐ πείθομαι 'that I do not believe you'. Lat. *credo*: Ter. Heaut. 4. 1. 11 *vin me istuc tibi . . . credere?* 'do you wish me to believe you that?' Germ. *das glaube mir*. Of other examples, aside from the Lat. *fidem habere alicui* (e. g. Ter. Eun. 1. 2. 117) 'to put trust in some one (lit. have trust to)', which is probably due to the analogy of verbs meaning 'to trust', I may mention the following: Skt. yā- 'to go': RV. 8. 26. 15 *asmábhyaṁ . . . yātám vartih* 'come the way to us'; Gr. πελάξω 'cause to approach': c 39 Ιλιόθεν με . . . ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν, 'Ισμάρῳ 'from Ilium a wind drove me to the Ciconians, to Ismarus'; Lat. *flecto*, O. H. G. *biugan* 'to bend': Ambr. Hym. 2. 6 Lat. *tibique genu flectimus* O. H. G. *dir joh chniu riugamēs* 'and to thee we bend our knee'.

In practically all of the examples so far mentioned the word found in the case of the indirect object designated a person, which is explained above by the normally more independent position a person occupies toward an action as compared with

a thing. In exceptional cases, however, the situation may make it perfectly clear that the person is the more directly affected, and then the primitive case of the indirect object might designate a thing as opposed to the direct personal object. A sentence like the just mentioned *'Ιλόθεν με ἄνεμος πέλασσεν Ισμάρῳ* would allow the place name Ismarus to be interpreted as the indirect object even if it were not characterized formally as a dative, since the whole context makes it clear that the place is not to be moved to the person, but the reverse, so that here exceptionally the personal object is the more intimately affected and is therefore felt as direct. In expressions like the Latin *demittere aliquem Orco* 'to send some one to the world below' the force of the preposition would be a second hindrance to reversing direct and indirect object; for the lower world could not possibly be sent down to a human being. On the other hand, an uninflected case of the indirect object clearly could not be used in expressions like Skt. *ágne náya . . . rāyé asmān*¹ 'Agni, lead us to wealth' (RV. I. 189. 1), *yám . . . praninátya mahaté saúbhagāya* 'whom it has led forth to great bliss' (ib. 3. 8. 11), Lat. *me . . . morti dabo* 'I shall give myself to death' (Plaut. Merc. 2. 4. 4). Since the ordinary conception would be rather that of bringing wealth, good fortune, and death to man rather than man to wealth, etc., the reverse could occur only when there was a formal characterization of the case of the indirect object. Such examples are therefore not to be classed as belonging to the uses of the dative inherited from the primitive case of the secondary object.

Where, however, two objects depending on one word are both non-personal, one normally will occupy a position of greater independence to the action of the verb than the other, and will therefore be felt as indirect object even when there is no difference as to inflectional ending. In Lat. *caelo palmas . . . tetendit* 'stretched out his hands to the sky' (Verg. Aen. 2. 688) the relative independence of the sky toward the action

¹ It might be supposed that the primitive dative could have been characterized by its position before it had received a suffix (cf. Wundt, loc. cit.), and would therefore be capable of expressing such unusual relations after all. I do not believe, however, that there is sufficient evidence to make us suppose that the position of the dative had been fixed so early.

is as great in comparison with the hands as usually of the person as opposed to the thing. Similar are *pelago Danaum* . . . *dona praecipitare* 'to throw to the sea the gift of the Greeks' (ib. 2. 36), *profundo vela dabit* 'will give sail to the deep', i. e. 'will set sail' (ib. 12. 263), and Gr. *νησὶ δὲ ἐπώπῳ* ἀρεπον . . . Ζεύς 'Zeus aroused (i. e. sent) a wind to the ships' (1. 67). It is not at all necessary to assume that there was any personification¹ in most of these locutions, while at the same time admitting the possibility of it here and there. On the whole they are simply and naturally derived from the case of the indirect object in its most vague and primitive form. We cannot, however, close our eyes to the fact that the extent to which these constructions were employed by Vergil and later Roman poets² must have been something purely artificial, and corresponds to nothing either in popular Latin or other languages.

The derivation of the dative from an undifferentiated primitive case of the indirect object will thus be seen to explain both the dominance of personal datives in these constructions as well as the fact that a few non-personal indirect objects do occur: it simply followed from the conditions under which one of two objects will be felt as relatively more independent of the action of the verb than the other. At the same time it explains how this same case could be used in many locutions where a place notion might either have actually crept in or have been read into them. Nearly all datives used with verbs of stretching out, bringing, sending, hurling, and many with verbs of giving and the like can be conceived in this way, and this was, as I believe, the starting-point which led the dative to adopt the ending of another primarily local case, which will be discussed below.

2. The Dative of the Secondary Object in Looser Connection with the Verb.

Between datives which are very closely and very loosely connected with the verb, between 'datives of the indirect

¹ Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda* 139, the author of the 'grammatical' theory, would apply the principle of personification even to the incontestably local *samudraya* 'to the sea' of p. 3.

² Cf. Landgraf, ALL. 8. 70.

object' and 'datives of interest', there is no difference as to essential nature, nor is there any sharp dividing line. Some of the examples already mentioned as being in closer connection may very well be taken as datives of advantage or disadvantage. Verbs meaning 'to consecrate' take a dative which may be translated by 'for' as well as 'to', e. g. Lat. *consecrare Iovi* 'to consecrate to' or 'for Jove'. So the dative after verbs of depriving may equally well be considered a dative of disadvantage, e. g. Plaut. Rud. 3. 4 54 *oculos eripiam tibi* may be 'I shall snatch you your eyes' or 'I shall snatch away your eyes for you'. We may say 'pardon us our sins' or 'pardon our sins for us'. The difference between the 'to' and 'for' datives in fact looms large to us principally because we have come to use different prepositions in most instances, but where we still use the case of the secondary object, the distinction is by no means sharp. We feel no essential difference between the use of the indirect object in 'tell us a story', the border-line case 'strike him a blow', and the datives of advantage in 'sing us a song', 'build yourselves a house', and 'buy her a present'. At the same time these English remnants show how these freer datives are just as independent of grammatical form as those in closer connection with the verb; for here also the English, which does not differ in form between direct and indirect object, is just as clear as the languages with these case distinctions. We may conclude, then, as far as the primitive uninflected I. E. dative is concerned, that it also was used whenever the presence of a direct object or internal object would make it clear that the secondary object had not only a looser connection with the verb than the primary object, but also one that was much more loose than in cases where we ordinarily speak of the 'indirect object'. And this means that of the historic 'datives of interest' those which are used with an object accusative go back as a type to the primitive uninflected dative.

The field of such a 'dative of interest' is very large indeed. It is not limited to a certain number of verbs which are habitually associated with certain double objects, but can be used in almost any connection. It will therefore not be feasible to subdivide the examples according to the verbs used with

them, which is not essential anyway, but rather according to whether the dative is a dative of advantage (or disadvantage) or an ethical dative or dative of the person judging, and secondarily, as far as feasible, according to whether the primary object is a direct object or accusative of effect or cognate accusative.

I. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with a Direct Object.* Skt. RV. I. 113. 4 *citrā vī dūro na ḏvah* ‘the brightly colored (Dawn) opened for us the gates’. RV. I. 15. 12 *devān devayatē yaja* ‘honor the gods for (the sake of) the pious’. AB. 7. 16. 1 *tasma upākṛitya niyoktāram na vividuh* ‘for him, when he had been brought up, they found no fetterer (one who would put him in chains)’. Av. Yt. 13. 99 *yō aśai ravō yaēša* ‘who for Aśa sought space’. Gr. H 314 *τοῖσι δὲ βοῦν ιέρευσεν* ‘for them he sacrificed a bull (to Zeus)’. P 547 *ἡρτε πορφυρέην ἱριν θητοῖσι ταύσσοντα Ζεύς* ‘as when Zeus stretches out for mortals the purple rainbow’. Xen. An. I. 3. 16 *τὰ ἄκρα ἤμιν . . . προκαταλαβεῖν* ‘to seize the heights beforehand for us’. Lat Plaut. Most. I. I. 44 *tu tibi istos habeas turtures, piscis, avis* ‘may you have (keep) for yourself those turtle-doves, fishes, birds’. ib. 3. I. 115 *continuo est alias aedis mercatus sibi* ‘at once he bought another dwelling for himself’. Hor. Carm. I. 17. 3 *defendit aestatem capellis* ‘wards off the heat for my goats’. Osc. T. B. 13. 14 *suaepis . . . altrei . . . zicolom dicust* ‘siquis alteri . . . diem dixerit’. Umbr. VI a 5 *aserio . . . anglat esona mehe, tote Ioueine* ‘observa . . . oscines divinas mihi, civitati Iguviniae’. Goth. Marc. 8. 19 *þans fimf hlaibans gabrak fimf þüsundjōm* ‘he broke the five loaves for five thousand’. O. H. G. Ot. I. 3. 11 *thia arca sīnēn kindon rihta in den undōn* directed the ark upon the waves for his children’. ib. 4. 29 *alt quena thīnu ist thir kind berantu* ‘your old wife shall bear you a son’. Lith. Jurk. 18 *kītq pāczę sau pasijęszkōje* ‘sought for himself another wife’. ib. 20 *asz jī tāu sužwejōsiu* ‘I will fish it (the ax) out for you’. O. Blg. *priobrěsti žiznъ sebě* ‘quaere tibi victim’.

II. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with an Accusative of Effect.* Skt. RV. I. 32. 2 *tvāṣṭ̄asmai vājram svaryām totakṣa* ‘Tvashtar made him his whizzing thunderbolt’. ib. 7. 87. 1 *rādat paikō várūnah śūryāya* ‘may Varuna open up paths for the sun’. Av. Y. 62. 7 *yaēbyō aēm hqmpačaiti*

xšāfnimča sūirimča ‘for whom he cooks the night and early meal’. Gr. Α δογ ἐκάστῳ δῶμα . . . ‘Ηφαιστος ποίησεν ‘for each one Hephaestus had built a house’. Pind. I. 8. 147 τῷ τις . . . Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω μυρσίνας στέφανον ‘therefore let some one twist a wreath of myrtle for C.’ Lat. Plaut. Most. I. I. 75 *mihi non facies moram* ‘you will not cause (make) delay for me’. id. Curc. I. I. 25 *num tu pudicae quoipiam insidias locas?* ‘are you laying an ambush for any modest (maiden)?’ Goth. Luc. 9. 33 *gawaúrkjaima hleiprōs prins, aina þus jah aina Mōsē jah aina Hēlijin* ‘let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah’. O. H. G. Wess. Pr. *dō gareti sanctus Johannes baptista den wech demo gotis sune* ‘thereupon St. John the Baptist prepared the way for the son of God’. Lith. Jurk. 80 *sàwa waikáms wék swôdbq taisi* ‘soon prepared a wedding for his children’. O. Blg. Zogr. Luc. 9. 33 *sztvorim̄s skiniję tri, tebě jedinq i jedinq Mosěovi i jedinq Ilijí* as in Goth.

III. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with an Internal Object (Cognate Accusative).* Whether the accusative is one of kindred formation with the verb or only of kindred meaning does not of course affect the nature of the dative. Skt. CB. II. 3. 3. 6 *dcāryāya kárma karoti* ‘for the teacher he performs a service’. Gr. Eur. Med. 1292 *δσα βροτοῖς ἔρεξας ἦδη κακά* ‘what evils you have already brought about for mortals’. Lat. Hor. C. 3. I. 4 *carmina non prius . . . virginibus puerisque canto* ‘before shall I not sing the songs for the maidens and boys’. M. H. G. *einen stoz stiez er im* = Eng. *he struck him a blow.*

WALTER PETERSEN.

BETHANY COLLEGE, LINDSBORG, KANSAS.

(*To be continued*)

II.—AN EPIGRAM OF PHILODEMUS AND TWO LATIN CONGENERS.

I.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND ANTH. LAT. 458.

Some years ago Professor K. F. Smith discussed very entertainingly in this journal¹ the history of the Latin epigram which is named as the source of Ben Jonson's familiar lyric,

Still to be neat, still to be dressed
As you were going to a feast;
Still to be powdered, still perfumed, etc.

The Latin verses, of unknown authorship and of uncertain time, but certainly antique, have come down in one of the several ancient collections of fugitive verse which modern scholars have combined into the so-called Anthologia Latina, and are printed as number 458 in the edition of Riese.² His text is as follows :

Semper munditas, semper Basilissa decores,
semper dispositas arte decente comas,
et comptos semper cultus unguentaque semper,
omnia sollicita compta videre manu,
non amo. neglectam, mihi se quae comit amica,
se det: inornata simplicitate valet.
vincula nec curet capit is discussa soluti,
nec decorat faciem: mel habet illa suum.
fingere se semper non est confidere amori.
quid quod saepe decor, cum prohibetur, adest?

Jonson's song is a very free rendering, it will be seen, of the general antithesis between the "adulteries of art" and native simplicity, which is the theme of the Latin verses. In actual words little has been borrowed, and in the latter part of the first stanza—

Lady it is to be presumed,
Though art's hid causes are not found,
All is not sweet, all is not sound—

¹ Vol. 29 (1908), pp. 133–155.

² Baehrens PLM IV, p. 83.

a thought is introduced which is scarcely hinted at in the Latin lines. However, the English scholars who made this identification were probably right, and had correct feeling in putting together the two poems. For, apart from the similarity of theme and the initial *munditas*, the essential point of resemblance, which deserves to be called imitation, is the anaphora of "still," very gracefully and musically introduced, corresponding to the repetition (which is not exactly anaphora) of *semper* in the Latin lines. It is in fact this repetition which is the most essential characteristic of the style of both poems, and constitutes no small part of such effectiveness as they possess. Toward the end of his paper (p. 154) Professor Smith inquires into the origin and time of the Latin poem, pointing out how difficult it is in compositions of this sort, the style of which had been fixed as early as Martial, to determine a date at any point between the second and the fifth centuries. He concludes with the suggestion that it may have been derived from a Greek epigram of the erotic type such as is represented so abundantly in the fifth book of the Palatine Anthology.

It is not quite with confidence that we can lay hand upon the exact and ultimate original which is thus surmised, but with confidence at least that a similar *motif*, with similar stylistic traits, can be cited from a known author and a known period of antiquity, that the attention is invited of those who may have been interested in Professor Smith's study. I refer to an epigram of Philodemus of Gadara, the Epicurean philosopher, client of L. Calpurnius Piso, whom Cicero characterizes without mention of his name, in the invective against his patron of the year 55 B. C. (in Pison. 68 ff.). In these days when the Palatine Anthology is little read, he is doubtless best known to classical students for the philosophical and rhetorical writings which have been recovered from the charred rolls of an Epicurean library at Herculaneum. Of his poems, all of which are short and fall under the comprehensive rubric of epigram, twenty-four, out of a somewhat larger number attributed to him, are recognized by Kaibel¹ as genuine. They are preserved in the Palatine and the Planudean Anthologies, and the

¹ *Philodemi Gadarensis Epigrammata*, ed. G. Kaibel, Ind. lect. Greifswald 1885.

one which I would here compare with our Latin epigram is A. P. XI 34:

Δευκότρους πάλι δὴ καὶ ψάλματα καὶ πάλι Χίους
οῖνος, καὶ πάλι δὴ σμύρνας ἔχειν Συρίην,
καὶ πάλι κωμάζειν, καὶ ἔχειν πάλι δυψάδα πόρην
οὐκ ἔθελοι μωσ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.
Ἄλλα μὲν παρκίσσοντος ἀναδῆσατε, καὶ πλαγιαύλων
γενέσατε, καὶ κροκίνοις χρίσατε γυῖα μύροις,
καὶ Μυτιληναῖ φύρα τενέμοντα τέγχατε Βάκχῳ,
καὶ συζεύξατε μοι φωλάδα παρθενικήν.¹

That these two poems have not been compared before, which seems to be the case, may be attributed to the relative neglect which has been the fate of all but the most famous writers embraced in the Greek Anthology, and to the almost total neglect of the whole of the Anthologia Latina. Still, while the resemblances of the Greek verses to our Latin poem are I think unmistakable, yet the differences are very considerable, and a relationship would not perhaps be assumed without a closer study of the two compositions. In the first place, while there is a

¹ The editions of Jacobs and of Dübner are of course accessible in any library. Kaibel's more recent publication is indispensable for the study of Philodemus, but as a university "program" of a distinguished scholar it has become very difficult to procure. For those who may not have any of these books at hand a few notes may be added: *λευκότρους* (*sc. στεφάνους*) i. e. wreaths woven of the *λευκός* (white violet), and apparently expensive or difficult to obtain. Cf. Theophr. ap. Athen. 15, p. 680 ε (*στεφανωματικὰ διηθη*) *πρῶτον τε τῶν διηθέων ἐκφανεσθαι φοῖσιν τὸ λευκός* . . . *ἴτειτα γάρκισσον*. For the comparison which I shall presently make with Horace the following is of interest (*ibid.* f.): *τὸ δὲ ὥδον ὑστερεῖ τούτων καὶ τελευταῖον μὲν φαίνεται, πρῶτον δὲ πανεται* (*rosa quo locorum sera moretur*). *Πλαγιαύλων γενέσατε* (a bold expression if the text is sound) "*tibiarum mīhi cantum percipiendum date*" (Jacobs), in contrast with the more difficult and elaborate music of stringed instruments (*ψάλματα*). A difference of opinion about the interpretation of the whole poem hinges upon the meaning of *φωλάδα παρθενικήν*. Jacobs and the older interpreters explain as, "meretricem e lupanari", i. e. ex lustro, e fornice (*φωλαός* = hole, cave, lurking-place). But Kaibel rejects this and holds that the poet is tired of revelry with harlots and longs for honorable wedlock. To this he says *συζεύξα* points as well as *παρθενική*. "*φωλάς ea est quae in cubili iacet*". He paraphrases: "facite ut virgo mecum cubile sive thalamum ingrediatur." But I doubt if he is right. The scene portrayed is merely a convivium and not a wedding-feast. *Παρθενική* is of course contrasted with *πόρην*, but probably not without a certain euphemism. *φωλάδα* I should explain, as against both Jacobs and Kaibel, to mean "obscure" or "humble", in contrast with the publicity of the fashionable courtesan's life.

common underlying contrast of elaboration and simplicity, yet the application is different in each poem accommodated to the situation which is created in each. In the Greek it is a *convivium*, and the antithesis is between elaborate and costly indulgence which leads to excess (*ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίν*), and festivity of a simpler and saner sort. In the Latin epigram the same antithesis is employed in quite a different setting, as admonition to the self-embellishing Basilissa. It is obvious that there can be no close parallelism of words, or that such as there is appears in a different context. Both poems are expressions of the taste of their respective authors; but the Greek is abstract and without reference to a person or an occasion: the Latin by reason of the personal address receives a special application and motive, and in consequence yields a somewhat different tone. But in spite of these differences there are very significant resemblances, and most of all the very characteristic iteration of *πάλι*, corresponding to the equally characteristic use of *semper*, and producing the effect of a crowded and unlimited list of items suggestive of excess or satiety. As with *semper* in the Latin poem, so this use of *πάλι* is carried through the first three lines, and the whole enumeration is concluded with *οὐκ ἔθέλω*, corresponding to *non amo*. As is so often the case with poetical reminiscences, they appear here especially at the beginning, and as the adaptation proceeds and is fitted to the special argument or occasion the resemblance to the source of the *motif* grows less. Thus one may believe that the author of the Latin epigram, carrying in mind the insistent rhythm and passionate rejection of the first part of this poem of Philodemus, has used its theme and copied its technique, but has adapted its thought to the desired purpose of an admonition or plea to his mistress.

For that it is a plea to the courtesan to be complaisant to her lover without the delays and postponements involved in elaborate toilet and coiffure may be guessed from the two epigrams which follow it in the codex Vossianus, the first of which is likewise addressed to Basilissa:

ante dies multos nisi te, Basilissa, rogavi
et nisi praemonui, te dare posse negas;

and,

cur differs, mea lux, rogata semper?

It would seem in fact that we have here a group of poems, possibly drawn from a larger cycle, all of which show a certain kinship with epigrams of Philodemus, whether or not we are justified in saying that they were composed under his immediate influence. One poem of the Epicurean philosopher we have already examined. It is creed of revelry, but free from gross eroticism, which mars some of his other verses, nor has the author forgotten his philosophy—μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.¹ With coarser and more drastic phrase a contrast, analogous to that which is drawn between the δυψάδα πόρνην and the φωλάδα παρθενικήν, was the theme of another composition by this same Philodemus, which is not preserved,² but is referred to and briefly summarized by Horace for the purposes of his scabrous argument in Serm. I 2, 120:

parabilem amo venerem facilemque.
illam 'post paulo' 'sed pluris', 'si exierit vir',
Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae neque magno
stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.

¹ An interesting comparison may be made with Lucretius, speaking from the same point of view of Epicurean praise of nature in contrast with the costly embellishments of art, II 24:

neque natura ipsa requirit,
si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacula per aedes, etc.

² A modern composition, apparently based upon Horace's lines, whether as a deliberate forgery or merely as the *jeu d'esprit* of some Dutch scholar, found its way into the excerpts from the Palatine MS. from which Reiske edited portions of the Anthology in 1754. It was reproduced by Brunck in the *Analecta* and even by Jacobs in his first edition, although he knew that it was not contained in the Palatine MS. Toup is said to have been the first one to cite the epigram in illustration of Horace. The whole history of this rather interesting literary curiosity is set forth by Jacobs in Wolf's *Literarische Analecten*, Vol. I (1817), p. 357 ff. The author evidently shrank from the coarseness of Horace's portrayal and sets on one side a figure of matronly severity, on the other a compliant courtesan ('Εφύρη, the girl from Corinth). The concluding couplet is as follows:

εἰ δὲ μίαν ταύταιν. Πεῖσον, μ' αἰρεῖν ἐπιτέλλεις,
εἰς 'Εφύρη μίμω, τὴν δ' ἀρά Γάλλος ἔχοι.

Much more in the spirit of Horace's lines, and doubtless imitated either from him or from the lost epigram of Philodemus, is Martial IX 32 (hanc volo, quae facilis, etc.).

To the humorously characterizing names of the courtesan *post paulo, sed pluris*, or of the adulteress *si exierit vir*, in the one class of undesirable amours, correspond the descriptive designations *quae neque cunctetur* and *neque magno stet pretio* in the other. It is to the former class that Basilissa belongs, elaborate, expensive, deferring. The *motif* of delay or postponement of the lover is not touched upon (except by implication) in the first of the Latin poems from which we started (*semper munditas*), nor does it appear in the extant epigram of Philodemus cited above. Their point of community is elaboration versus simplicity. But in the two succeeding epigrams of the Basilissa cycle, delay or postponement is the main theme, as it was in the composition which Horace reports (*quae cunctetur*). The conceit was apparently a favorite one with Philodemus and appears again in a clever piece of realistic dialogue which makes up another of his compositions—a mime of Herondas compressed into the brevity of an epigram, A. P. V 46.¹

Putting together therefore the fact that the first of the Latin epigrams (*semper munditas*) corresponds in theme and in stylistic treatment (*πάλι—semper*) and even in some verbal echoes (*οὐκ ἔθελω—non amo*) to the extant epigram of Philodemus—putting this with the circumstance that the second and third of the skits addressed to Basilissa play upon the same *motif* of delay and postponement which was contained in the epigram alluded to by Horace, it will seem most plausible I think to believe that the author of the Latin epigram wrote with conscious adaptation of poems of Philodemus, one of which we still possess.

II.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND HORACE OD. I 38.

We have not been in the habit of associating Horace's lyric poetry with contemporary influences,² and it will doubtless seem

¹ α. Πηρίκα δ' ἥξεις;

β. Ἡν σὺ θέλεις ὄρην. α. Εἴθει θέλω. β. Πρόσαγε.

² Apropos of this remark, my friend Professor Gordon Laing, who very kindly read these notes in manuscript, called my attention to Reitzenstein's valuable address (in N. Jhbb. Vol. 21 (1908), p. 81 ff.) entitled "Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik". As the title indicates it is the author's purpose to point out how much of Hellenistic (in contrast with Aeolic or Pindaric) motive and technique is present in the Odes.

a far cry from this epigram to *Persicos odi*; and yet I venture to believe that Horace drew the suggestion of his ode from just this source, viz., the lines of Philodemus quoted above—λευκούνους πάλι δῆ, κτλ. Like the Greek the scene is the *convivium*, or its preparations, and the contrast of elaboration and simplicity is the same. The enumerated items of the Greek Horace has compacted into a single generalization,

Persicos odi puer apparatus,

odi corresponding to the concluding οὐκ ἔθέλω of Philodemus, although the word itself was probably suggested by the following μωσ ταῦτα. In the subsequent development of Horace's poem he has selected from the varied items of elaborated revelry just one, the floral ornaments,

displacent nexae philyra coronae,

corresponding to the λευκούνους (*στεφάνους*) with which Philodemus begins. This thought is then expanded with a further detail,

mitte sectari rosa quo locorum, etc.

The transition from the negative to the positive is made by Philodemus with ἀλλά με ναρκίσσους, corresponding to

simplici myrto nihil adlabores,

and as the first part confines itself to only one of the elements enumerated by Philodemus, so the remainder of Horace's lines are taken up with the praise of the myrtle,

neque te ministrum
dedecet myrtus, etc.

The evidence of relationship rests upon identity of general theme and situation, with identical antithesis, upon the resemblance of λευκούνους with *nexae philyra coronae*, and of *odi*—*nihil curo* with μωσ—οὐκ ἔθέλω. The differences are of course

More especially, as bearing on the present argument, I would note that he there (p. 95) has put side by side our epigram of Philodemus with *Persicos odi*. More cautiously and perhaps more truly than I have done, he designates the relationship, not as one of dependence or immediate suggestion, but as displaying the same feeling (dasselbe Empfinden). He adds also some interesting illustrations of the conceit of the master giving instructions to his slave. Noteworthy throughout his treatment is the extent to which he uses Philodemus in illustration of Horace.

more remarkable.¹ The art of the one depends upon crowded enumeration (which the repeated πάλι reinforces), of the other upon almost parsimonious selection. The simplicity of Horace is seen in stronger light by this comparison, and may seem almost ostentatious. But as for the artistic result there can be no two opinions. So far from detracting from the reputation and merit of Horace, the disclosure of a source of suggestion serves only to heighten our appreciation of his taste and delicate workmanship. If we had no knowledge of Horace's acquaintance with Philodemus, it would doubtless be most natural to speak of both poets as handling independently a *motif* common to the poetical *nugae*² of the time; but in view of the fact that Horace in the second satire expressly alludes to Philodemus and summarizes a related epigram, it seems to me most probable to conclude that he derived the suggestion of his ode from the still extant epigram of Philodemus.

But it is one thing for Horace, in an early satire of cynical morality and dubious taste, to have cited an apposite epigram of Philodemus: quite another thing to assume an influence of the Greek versifier upon the mature lyric poet of a dozen or more years later. It may not therefore be amiss to review briefly some of the evidence concerning the position and influence of Philodemus in the Roman society of his day. He is first introduced to us by Cicero in the anonymous characterization referred to above (in Pison. 68). It is obvious that in this passage Philodemus suffers some contamination from the virulence of Cicero's invective against his patron, and yet while the character of the man suffers at Cicero's hands, the description of his poetry is generous, and earns the kind of praise which must have

¹ Although the situation in the two poems is similar, in that both deal with the appointments for the *convivium*, yet there is one difference of technique which might escape observation. Philodemus speaks without personal reference or allusion to any occasion. He creates no scene or situation. Horace, not only here, but elsewhere, with strikingly few exceptions (not more than two or three) does not speak directly from the page of his book to the reader, in the manner of Philodemus and of much modern lyric poetry. He always gives a motivation to his utterance either by addressing a person (as here *puer*, or a friend who is named), a muse or a god, or by personifying an object of address (*o navis, te triste lignum, pia testa*, etc.).

² Vid. A. P. X 104 χαίρε θεὰ δέσποινα . . . εὐτελήν.

been sought for in this style of elegant lubricity ; poema porro facit ita festivum, ita concinnum, ita elegans, nihil ut fieri possit argutius ; in quo reprehendat eum licet, si qui volet, modo leviter, non ut impurum, non ut improbum, non ut audacem, sed ut Graeculum, ut adsentatorem, ut poetam . . . De ipso (Pisone) quoque scripsit, ut omnis hominis libidines, omnia stupra, *omnia cenarum conviviorumque genera*, adulteria denique eius delicatissimis versibus expresserit. There is enough of this sort of thing in the extant epigrams (though not specifically with reference to Piso) to make the characterization wholly credible, but there are on the other hand some very charming pieces which have quite the flavor of Horatian urbanity and philosophy.¹ Indeed it would seem certain that Cicero himself thought better of Philodemus than would appear from his utterances in the invective against Piso, or at any rate formed a more favorable opinion at a later time. For in the de Fin. (II 119), of the year 45, he is named along with Siro, the teacher of Virgil, as *familares nostros, cum optimos viros, tum homines doctissimos*. His association with Siro in this passage is significant, and it is valuable to learn that he was one of those Epicurean teachers who influenced so strongly that group of younger men who appear in the next generation as the leaders in poetry and letters. That Virgil was the devoted pupil of Siro we know from his own Catalepta (7 and 10) as well as from the ancient lives and the Servian Scholia ; that Quintilius Varus was also a fellow pupil is the interpretation which must be given to the name Varus associated with Virgil's in the same passages ;² that L. Varius, the epic and tragic poet, was an Epicurean is attested by Quintilian (6, 3, 78),³ although we have no record that would associate him with the instruction of Siro. It is clear therefore that the group of Horace's most intimate friends were Epicureans, and two of them at least disciples of Siro. It is, of course, superfluous to remind the reader that Horace himself in his earliest work does not yet profess that eclecticism (*nullius*

¹ See especially the invitation to Piso to join in the Epicurean festival of the "twentieth", A. P. XI 44.

² Donatus, vit. Verg. (Reiff. Sueton. p. 68) and Servius ad Ecl. 6, 13.

³ The editors read *Varo*, the MSS. *Vareo*, which, as Körte says, points to *Vario*. Cf. Körte in the article cited below.

*addictus iurare in verba magistri) which was his maturer philosophical position. In the satires he is frankly Epicurean (*namque deos didici securum agere aevum*, in the playful confession of faith at the end of the journey to Brundisium).*

It has been one of the disappointments of the Herculanean rolls of Philodemus, so strangely preserved and so ingeniously though imperfectly deciphered—treatises which, even in their fragile and broken characters traced upon charred papyrus, have contributed not a little to the later history of philosophical and rhetorical controversy—that they yield a literature so slight and unimportant, and so barren of significance for the time and environment in which they were produced. But here and there are names and personal allusions to comrades or pupils, especially at the beginning and end of treatises. Two such fragments are discussed by A. Körte in Rh. Mus. 45 (1890), p. 172 ff. under the title “Augusteer bei Philodem”. The discussion is too technical to be reported in detail, and is easily accessible for those who would follow the matter further. In the first fragment a group of his pupils or listeners are addressed, who having already heard fragmentary parts of the oral discussion of the theme in question (apparently *περὶ κολακείας*) are now asked to give a cordial reception to the completed work. The certain names which appear (in the vocative) are those of Varius and Quintilius, a grouping which can of course mean no other than the comrades of Virgil and Horace; one other name is wholly lost, while the initial V (*i. e.* Ov-) of a fourth is still legible. Who would not leap at once to the conjecture of Virgil's name? But this is not all. Still another fragment, at first sight a mere printer's pie of letters, reveals in the first line enough to reconstruct *φιλαργυρία* (apparently the theme), and in the fourth and fifth lines a group of names (in the vocative) of which the following letters survive

. . . τικαῖοναρι
. . . καικοῖτιλι

Here at all events are Varius and Quintilius again, and Varius may well, as before, have been followed by the mysterious Ov- of the former fragment. But whether Virgil was named in the lacuna or not, it is of more interest to speculate upon the trace that is left of the preceding name, -tie. And again, since specu-

lation is free, who could refrain from filling out the lacuna with *Opa]re*? Körte is sober and checks the ardor of his readers with the warning that nothing certain can be gathered from traces so slight (p. 177). And of course he is quite right. However, if any one will take the trouble to put together the Roman gentile names ending in *-tius*—*Trebatus*, *Numatius*, etc., he will soon discover that the field of possible conjecture is greatly narrowed, and that it will not be easy (if indeed possible) to fix upon any name equally probable with that of *Horatius*. But the identification need not be pressed, and we can satisfy ourselves with the certain names, which reveal that the friends of Horace were also the friends and listeners of Philodemus. From the mention of Philodemus in Serm. I 2, 121 it appears that he was a contemporary, and still living, as indeed for other reasons we should have reason to believe. To quote the witticism of a contemporary with approval of its point and acceptance of its doctrine is of course a compliment (however dubious in the present context), and from this perhaps we are justified in concluding that a personal relationship of friendship existed between the two men. It may be noted in contrast that the epigram of Callimachus used just before (v. 109 *hiscine versiculis*) is introduced without name. At all events not only from the epigram quoted does it appear that Horace was well acquainted with the poems of Philodemus, but also from other parts of this same satire it is apparent that he had in mind words and ideas of the same author drawn from other epigrams still extant. That Horace's *o crus, o bracchia*, (v. 92) is an echo of ὁ ποδός, ὁ κνήμης (A. P. V 132), is observed by Jacobs, who also calls attention to the general resemblance of the argument of Horace's second satire with V 126. Details of comparison could be made, but they would not ornament the page nor edify the reader.¹ More wholesome are comparisons of some other epigrams with other parts of Horace, (such as V 112 καὶ παιζειν ὅτε καιρός, with *nec lusisse pudet*, etc.), which I shall not now undertake to collect. Many isolated parallels to Horace will be found in Jacobs' notes, (vol. VIII, p. 211 ff.), and on A. P. IX 412 he observes of the

¹ For no reason except its offensiveness Kaibel rejects this epigram as a forgery suggested by Horace. He seems to have forgotten the *libidines* and *stupra* which shocked Cicero (*supra* p. 35).

whole argument : " prorsus Horatiana philosophia, quae saepe conspicitur in poematiis Philodemi ". It is the more remarkable therefore (and perhaps a warning also against a hasty conclusion) that he does not place *Persicos odi* in comparison with our epigram XI 34. Nor does Kaibel mention it. But still more remarkable is the fact that no editor of Horace, so far as I have observed, has made the comparison. That the resemblance has been observed however can scarcely be doubted, and the brief notes of the Didot edition of the Anthology conclude with the laconic " cf. Horatii od. I 38."

The comparison with Philodemus, whatever may be thought of its value as furnishing a point of reference for judging the Roman poet's art, can scarcely be thought of as contributing anything to the understanding of the Horatian ode itself. It does however have a certain bearing upon an old problem concerning the constitution of the first book, which has been revived in recent years by several German critics, and especially by Vollmer in his discussion of the Horatian text tradition.¹ Very briefly stated the point is this : that in view of book II with twenty numbers, III with thirty, IV with fifteen, and recalling also Serm. I with ten, and Epp. I with twenty, it has seemed that the thirty-eight numbers of book I called for some justification or explanation of the number indivisible by five, which has been variously attempted. The solution which Vollmer eventually adopts is, that the book originally consisted of numbers 4–38–35,² and in this form was passed about privately in the circle of Maecenas ; that upon its publication in definitive form 1–3 were added, thus producing the numerical dissonance. As an alternative explanation Vollmer suggests the possibility that *Persicos odi* in its present form is incomplete, and that perhaps the remaining fragment and two other poems (which would make up the desired forty) have fallen out.³ The utter

¹ Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz. Philol. Supplementband X (1905), p. 280, n. 37.

² The same suggestion is made by Belling, Liederbücher des Horatius, Berlin, 1903, p. 115.

³ Luc. Müller (Odes, I, p. 128), influenced by similar considerations, had also remarked : " Es erscheint daher sehr glaublich, dass hinter I 38 zwei Oden verloren gegangen sind." See the supplementary note at the end of this paper.

improbability of this hypothesis from the standpoint of our text tradition Vollmer concedes. But from the point of view of aesthetic criticism he holds that I 38 forms a very lame conclusion to book I, in comparison with such manifest epilogues as II 20 and III 30. He thinks it by no means clear that I 38 is a completed poem, and contends that the possibility must be entertained that the myrtle and other preparations of festivity await a Myrtale or a Rhode, who has vanished along with a couple of concluding stanzas. Whatever value may be attached to this speculation—and it need not be taken too seriously—it at least may afford occasion for the observation, that *Persicos odi* has the same formal completeness of structure as the Greek epigram which suggested the theme; that is, a negative thesis of that which is not wished (*οὐκ θέλω*) followed by a positive antithesis of that which is desired (*ἀλλά με*). To be sure the erotic touch which Vollmer misses in I 38 is found in the Greek verses, but nevertheless the perfect formal balance of the two compositions entirely excludes the thought of anything more in the Latin lines. It would have pleased Lessing, one may guess, for the purposes of his argument in vindication of Horace—*Rettung des Horaz*—to have observed that the erotic element present in the poem of Philodemus has been entirely eliminated. Not however from any prudery or moral purpose, but because the very structure of the poem (as our comparison has shown) rests upon the treatment of a single item out of the many appurtenances of luxurious festivity which Philodemus names. To have introduced a Pyrrha or a Lyde would have been just as alien to the poet's purpose, as to have brought in the wine, the perfumes, and the music of the scene in Philodemus.

Various meanings have been assigned to this little poem in its position at the end of the first book—either as a quiet contrast to the vehemence of the preceding description of the flight and death of Cleopatra, or as comprehending in the mention of the myrtle of Venus and the vine of Bacchus the conventional themes of lyric verse—but they overlook the natural emphasis which runs through the lines, first negatively—*odi*, *displacent*, *mitte*, and then positively—*simplici myrto*, and of these words the essential one, picked out by its position, is the adjective. The truth is, I suspect, that not without deliberate motive, and with full consciousness of the personal significance which usage

attached to the epilogue, the poet has here employed an opportunity to set forth a personal creed, his love of simplicity. It is true that such a definite note of personal expression cannot be attached either to the final epode nor to the last satire of the second book.¹ But with these exceptions all of the remaining books of Horace present well defined conclusions, and at least four of them are expressions of the poet's own consciousness and personality—the biographical characterization of Epp. I 20, the prophecy and the assurance of immortality in Odes II 20 and III 30, and the polemical defence of his literary position in Serm. I 10. One cannot therefore easily escape the feeling that a final poem by the very fact of its position may have some such meaning, and that to seek it is merely to follow the guidance of the poet's own practice. And what is more natural than that here at the end of the first offering of lyric poems Horace should set down his general profession of faith, his creed of life and of letters. For the former he has to be sure given indications in earlier poems of the first book, and it is not without interest to compare with our thirty-eighth the similar antithesis between luxury and frugality which is contained in the third and fourth stanzas of I 31 (*Quid dedicatum*).

Premant Calenam falce quibus dedit
fortuna vitem,

* * * * *

Me pascunt olivae,
me cichorea levesque malvae.

But there was more to be conveyed and in a more significant place. Horace has laid before his readers a book of lyric poems which did not follow the stylistic traditions either of Greek models, or of such Roman predecessors as had assayed a similar task. "In translating Greek lyric," as Professor Shorey says (Odes, xviii), "the student must ransack his dictionary for terms rich enough to represent the luxuriance of the Greek compound epithets." Something of this same search, either in the pages of Pacuvius or in the resources of invention, the earlier Roman lyric poets had made, from the bolder efforts of Laevius (*trisaeclisnenex*, *dulciorelocus*, *pudoricolorem*, etc.) to the more sober attempts of Catullus in the same direction

¹ And for the benefit of adherents to the pentad or decade theory it should be noted that these two exceptions (disregarding I 38) are found in books with a total which is not a multiple of 5 or 10.

(*sagittiferos*, *septemgeminus*, *lasarpiciferis*, etc.).¹ Horace in conscious contrast to such experiments, and true to his principle of restraint and Latin purity had not sought to vie with the gorgeous colors of his Greek models. His medium was, so to speak, black and white. "In considering the means with which he worked, the first thing that strikes us is the simplicity, not to say the poverty of his poetical vocabulary" (Shorey, *ibid.*). A certain amount of poverty there doubtless was, both inherent in the Latin vocabulary, and in the poet's own gifts and temperament, but no small part of it arises from a theory of style which repudiated ornament, and prized restraint and low lights. The expression of this principle, consonant with his personal taste and philosophy of life, we may suspect that he has given here in slight and transparent allegory.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

NEW HAVEN.

¹ I use the compound epithet (as suggested by Shorey) merely as an illustration, not as embracing the whole theory of style.

[Supplementary note to p. 38 extr. above.]

The protagonist of the doctrine of decades and pentads in the arrangement of the poems of Horace is Belling, in the work referred to above (p. 38). The same scholar (in other publications on Tibullus, Virgil, and Propertius) has pursued his principle through practically all of the Augustan poets, and I fear has succeeded rather in discrediting the kernel of truth from which he starts—it was indicated in all essentials by Kiessling in *Phil. Untersuch.* II, p. 73—than in establishing his own theories. Belling dedicates his book *pis manibus Adolfi Kiessling*, but the spirit of that vigorous scholar can have little joy in the subtleties of his over-zealous disciple. The decade theory is therefore recent, but the doctrine appeared in practical application more than a century before. For in 1778, in the January number of the Gentleman's Magazine (Vol. 48, p. 38) there appeared "two additional Odes to the First Book of Horace, lately discovered in the Palatine Library, communicated by Gaspar Pallavacini, Sub-Librarian, with a Commentary." They are numbered I 39 ad Julium Florum, and I 40 ad Librum suum. The discoverer professes to have found them upon a single sheet "laceratam excerptamque ex aliqua editione Horatiana . . . et forsitan prima"; and he adds "Chartam ipsam in Archivis tutissime recondidi". The readers of the Gentleman's Magazine seem to have taken the poems in good faith, and in the subsequent issues of the year contribute a number of translations. Other echoes of the discovery in the literature of the time seem very scarce, and indeed it is not probable that English classical scholars ever took the new odes seriously. However they were

reprinted in the same year in the ambitious edition of Jani (Leipz. 1778), and they appear in the old Teubner text of Jahn through the successive editions down to the sixth (revised by Th. Schmid in 1857), where they are placed after I 38, each headed by the words *carmen spurium*. Meyer also included them in his Anthologia Latina I, p. 41. English editors seem to have been less hospitable. Anthon in his first edition made them accessible to American scholars, but they are omitted from later issues. Jahn cites a monograph of Iul. Bernh. Ballenstedt, "Über zwei neuerlich entdeckte dem Horaz zugeschriebene Oden," Hannover, 1781, and the British Museum Catalogue contains the entry, "A dissertation concerning two Odes of [or rather ascribed to] Horace [marked as Carm. Lib. I, Ode 39-40] which have been discovered in the Palatine Library at Rome", London, 1789. Mitscherlich assigns to the year 1760 an edition of Prague containing the new odes, which was published without date. If this assignment were correct it might be argued that the forgery is of the Renaissance period (as Lucian Müller, Odes I, p. 128, says). But the truth about the Prague edition is probably given more accurately by the British Museum Catalogue, which contains the following title and comment: "Q. Horatii Flacci Opera omnia, ad exemplar Bentlei excusa (nunc insertis duabus odis novissime repertis aucta, addita quoque de harum odarum inventione epistola G. Pallavacini). 2. tom. Prague, 1775? -80. Privately printed. The second title page, with the leaf containing the letter of Pallavacini, and the two newly discovered odes, inserted between pp. 83 and 84, and here paged 83 i-iv, were printed and added to this edition in 1780." As to the identity of the discoverer a suspicion may be entertained, though I presume it could be resolved either positively or negatively by any one in communication with the records of the Vatican library. It is noteworthy in this connection that Mitscherlich, and the title cited by L. Müller from a sale catalogue, both insert the word "principis" before the name "G. Pallavacini". My reason for suspecting the genuineness of the communication to the Gentleman's Magazine arose in the first instance from the character of the communication itself, and was confirmed by Fea's remark in the preface to his edition (Rome, 1811, I, p. xxxiii) upon the discovery of the odes: "Quisquis ille primus fuerit tanto honore dignus, is certe impostor fuit putidissimus: nullibi enim vel in MSS. Vaticanis, vel in aliis Romanis eas reperire potui". Fea at any rate was in Rome (born in 1753) and in position to ascertain the truth.

The first two lines of the "fortieth" ode (ad librum suum) will perhaps suffice to illustrate the method of fabrication:

Dulci libello nemo sodalium
forsan meorum charior exittit;

which is of course an adaption of the words and rhythm of *Pompeii meorum prime sodalium*, with situation and hints drawn from Epp. I 20 (*carus eris*, etc.). In fact the workmanship throughout is so crassly imitative, that one can scarcely repress the suspicion that the Italian "Sub-Librarian" was merely the mask of some Oxford or Cambridge wag, playing upon the heavy respectability of classical studies as aired in

the Gentleman's Magazine. Of the explanatory notes which accompany the original publication a correspondent of February, 1778 (p. 87), says: "they are paltry in the extreme". But they are better than paltry, they are ludicrous, and seem in fact meant as a parody upon the pedantries of annotation, e. g. "Ex hac Ode (40) luce clarius extat, hunc primum librum primo in publicum prodiisse." But the jester (if my suspicion is right) seems to have carried off his hoax successfully so far as his immediate audience was concerned, and in maintaining a place, even though suspected, in sober editions for nearly a century he doubtless succeeded far beyond his expectation. I have set forth the matter at such length merely as an amusing curiosity. The only serious reason that justifies attention to the subject is the fact that 40 apparently seemed a more reasonable number of odes for the first book, and that the 38th seemed an inadequate epilogue.

III.—RHETORICAL ELEMENTS IN LIVY'S DIRECT SPEECHES.

PART II.

Following Part I of this article (A. J. P., XXXVIII 125 ff.), in which the more important Figures of Thought employed by Livy in sixty-seven of the direct speeches were examined and discussed, the same procedure will here be followed with respect to Figures of Expression, and results for the entire study will be given as to Livy's usage, passing from the earlier to the later parts of his work.

ANAPHORA.

This figure is frequently discussed by ancient rhetoricians, and, with its subdivisions (see below), is variously denominated.¹ Likewise, the grace, life, and energy of style gained by its employment are recognized.² That anaphora serves well

¹ Phoeb. Rhet. Gr., III, 46: ἐπαναφορὰ δέ ἔστιν, η καὶ ἀναφορά, πλειόνων στήχων η κώλων ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν ἀρχή. Donat. Gr. Lat., IV, 398: "Anaphora est relatio eiusdem verbi per principia versuum plurimorum"; see also Diomed. Gr. Lat., I, p. 445; Beda, RLM., 609, 10. The author of Ad Her., IV, 13, 19 uses repetitio as a general designation, "repetitio est, cum continentur ab uno atque eodem uerbo in rebus similibus et diuersis principia sumuntur." Quint., who (IX, 3, 28-34) discusses the emphasis gained by the addition or repetition of words, introduces (§ 30) an example of anaphora (Cic. In Cat., I, 2) without using the term.

² Demetr. Rhet. Gr., III, 294, 7: χαριευτίζεται δέ ποτε καὶ ἐξ ἀναφορᾶς. Ad Her. (l. c.): "Haec exornatio cum multum uenustatis habet tum grauitatis et acrimoniae plurimum. Quare uidetur esse adhibenda et ad ornandam et ad exaugendam orationem"; Quint., IX, 3, 28: "Illud est acrius genus [schematum], quod non tantum in ratione positum est loquendi, sed ipsis sensibus cum gratiam tum etiam vires accommodat. Ex quibus primum sit, quod fit adiectione"; Volkmann (op. cit.), p. 467: "Heftig und mit Nachdruck fangen mehrere Glieder der Rede nach einander mit denselben Worten an"; Haupt (op. cit.), p. 48: "Will der Schriftsteller irgend einen Begriff eine Beziehung oder eine bestimmte Nüance des Gedankens hervorheben, so liegt zunächst nichts näher, als eine Wiederholung des bezeichnenden Wortes." Palmer, *The Use of Anaphora, etc.* (Yale Diss. 1915), analyzes the means by which anaphora imparts emphasis, and concludes (p. 81) that the amplification of a general truth is one of the principal purposes served by the use of the figure.

the aims of rhetorical ornamentation is evidenced by the great frequency with which it occurs in the works of orators and writers of conscious rhetorical purpose—Demosthenes, Cicero, Tacitus, Quintilian. It is used very freely by Livy, and constitutes a conspicuous feature of the speeches,¹ in which, in those under review, I have counted three hundred seventy-six examples.² Some of the more noteworthy instances will here be given, with a consideration of usage by individual speakers.

Emphasis is most striking when the repeated element is made up of two words, especially if the anaphora is four- or fivefold, as in 28, 27, 12 *qui mihi ne hodie quidem scire videmini quid facinoris in me, quid in patriam parentesque ac liberos*

¹ Moczyński (*op. cit.*), p. 22: "Usitatissima apud Livium est repetitionis figura, qua in orationibus potissimum vis quaedam et gravitas efficitur"; Petzke (*op. cit.*), p. 55: "Livius anaphoram orationibus, eisque directis, saepius immiscuit; qua re splendorem ac copiam verborum maxime videtur respexisse"; Haupt, p. 51: "In ihr [Anapher] hat sich das rhetorische Moment der Sprache am deutlichsten ausgeprägt, jener Sprache, welche auf dem Forum im lebendigen Streite der Parteien, in den grossen Staatsreden der Tribunen und Konsuln vornehmlich alle die Mittel sich ausgestalten musste, Deshalb tritt namentlich in den Reden des Livius die Kraft dieser Anordnung recht anschaulich zu Tage"; Steele, *Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy*, T.A.P.A., xxxii, p. 185: "Anaphora, emphasizing by repetition, is one of the most marked rhetorical features of the Speeches"; Norden, I, p. 237: "Von den Redefiguren [bei Livius] ist häufig nur die natürliche und wirksamste, die Anapher."

² In the speeches are found a large proportion of Livy's conditional statements which form anaphora; verbs and nouns are less frequent. Many examples are cited by Steele (*cf. note 1 above*) in his detailed study. As by him, so here consideration is given only to verbal anaphora (repetition of the same or closely similar word in successive statements), as opposed to clausal anaphora (repetition of groups of words in parallel construction). The definition of anaphóra by Ad Her. (*see note 1, p. 44*) is the generally accepted one prior to Nägelebach (*op. cit. p. 639*), who would widen it to include "die Wiederkehr derselben Wortfolge entweder in dem nämlichen Satze oder in verschiedenen". This latter phenomenon is ordinarily called concinnitas, which Nägelebach (*p. 642*) regards as the genus of which both anaphora and chiasmus are species. Jahn (*Blätt. f. bayer. Gymn.*, III, p. 272 ff.) rejects this enlarged use of the term anaphora, which may properly be used only as the opposite of epiphora (repetition at the end of successive statements), whereas Nägelebach has in mind members of clauses which correspond logically, and which at the same time are so arranged that they correspond in order.

vestros, quid in deos sacramenti testes, quid adversus auspicia, . . . quid adversus morem militiae disciplinamque maiorum, quid adversus summi imperii maiestatemque ausi sitis; 7, 40, 8 si cui genus, si cui sua virtus, si cui etiam maiestas, si cui honores subdere spiritus potuerunt; 25, 6, 18 ne qua spes, ne qua occasio abolendae ignominiae, ne qua placandae civium irae, ne qua denique bene moriendi sit; 32, 21, 13 quid ita passus est Eretriam Carystumque capi? quid ita tot Thessaliae urbes? quid ita Locridem Phocidemque? quid ita nunc Elatiam oppugnari patitur? 9, 9, 18 Samnitibus sponsores nos sumus rei satis locupletes in id, quod nostrum est, in id, quod praestare possumus, corpora nostra et animos: in haec saeviant, in haec ferrum, in haec iras acuant. In most cases the anaphora, as indicative of less excitement, is two- or threefold, e. g. 40, 10, 10 pro isto Romani stant, pro isto omnes urbes tuo imperio liberatae, pro isto Macedones qui pace Romana gaudent; 45, 38, 11 tot de Gallis triumphi, tot de Hispanis, tot de Poenis? 6, 40, 13 si quis patricius, si quis Claudius diceret; 30, 14, 10 etiamsi non civis Carthaginiensis esset, etiamsi non patrem eius imperatorem hostium viderent; 3, 17, 6; 6, 40, 7; 8, 4, 3; 21, 13, 3; 21, 44, 5; 28, 41, 11; 30, 14, 10; 34, 6, 14.

Of pronouns, interrogatives (under which particles are included) are found most frequently,¹ with a total of fifty examples. By repetition the speaker draws attention item by item to details and contrasted phases of the subject under presentation, as in 28, 27, 12 (given above), or in 9, 1, 7 quid ultra tibi, Romane, quid foederi, quid diis arbitris foederis debeo? quem tibi tuarum irarum, quem meorum suppliciorum iudicem feram? 9, 9, 16 quid enim vobiscum . . . quid cum populo Romano actum est? quis vos appellare potest, quis se a vobis dicere deceptum? 28, 29, 4 horret animus referre, quid crediderint homines, quid speraverint, quid optaverint. Notable for variety of forms is 44, 22, 8 sunt qui . . . ubi castra locanda sint scient, quae loca praesidiis occupanda, quando aut quo saltu intranda Macedonia, ubi horrea ponenda, qua terra mari subvehantur commeatus, quando cum hoste manus conserendae,

¹ This result, while differing from Livy's usage as a whole (cf. Steele, p. 163, "Interrogative forms are less numerous than are relatives"), is due to the great preponderance of rhetorical questions in the direct speeches; see above Part I, p. 135 ff.

quando quiesse sit melius. In 41, 24, 17 *quid* introduces four complete sentences, *quid hoc adversus Romana foedera est?* *quid rem parvam et apertam magnam et suspectam facimus?* *quid vanos tumultus ciemus?* *quid . . . suspectos alios invisosque efficimus?* Direct disjunctives are illustrated by 5, 3, 6 *utrum enim defenditis an inpugnatis plebem?* *utrum militantium adversarii estis an causam agitis?* 28, 43, 13 *utrum major aliqua nunc in Africa calamitas accepta est . . . ? an maiores nunc sunt exercitus in Africa . . . ? an aetas mea tunc maturior bello gerendo fuit . . . ? an cum Carthaginiensi hoste in Hispania quam in Africa bellum geri aptius est?* The use of other particles may be exemplified by the following: 34, 6, 17 *cur pecunias reddimus privatis?* *cur publica praesenti pecunia locamus?* *cur servi . . . non emuntur?* *cur privati non damus remiges . . . ?* 34, 5, 9 *nonne id agmen, quo obruta haec urbs esset, matronae averterunt?* *nonne matronae consensu omnium [aurum] in publicum contulerunt?* *nonne . . . viduarum pecuniae adiuverunt aerarium?* 3, 67, 10 *ecquando unam urbem habere, ecquando communem hanc esse patriam licebit?* 38, 47, 12 *quotiens agri eorum vastati sint, quotiens praedae abactae, referant.* Relatives and indefinites are well represented, in most cases by two-, but also by three- and fourfold anaphora, as in 44, 22, 12 *ab his qui intersunt . . . qui hostem, qui temporum opportunitatem vident, qui in eodem velut navigio participes sunt periculi;* 6, 41, 2; 39, 36, 13; 21, 41, 8 *qui iussus ab consule nostro praesidium deduxit ab Eryce, qui graves inpositas victis Carthaginiensibus leges accepit, qui . . . stipendum populo Romano dare pactus est;* 45, 24, 12 *quidquid Rhodiorum virorum ac feminarum est . . . quidquid publici quidquid privati est;* 38, 17, 11; 38, 47, 6; 38, 48, 4; 41, 24, 11; 45, 24, 12. Sometimes the repeated pronouns are of different cases, e. g. 10, 8, 5; 21, 40, 5; 27, 13, 3; 39, 16, 13; 40, 10, 9. The most notable examples of demonstratives are: 5, 54, 7 *hic Capitolium est, . . . hic, cum augurato liberaretur Capitolium, Iuventas Terminusque maximo gaudio patrum vestrorum moveri se non passi;* *hic Vestae ignes, hic ancilia caelo demissa, hic omnes propitii manentibus vobis dii;* 9, 34, 3 *haec est eadem familia, . . . haec, adversus quam tribunicium auxilium vobis comparastis;* *haec, propter quam duo exercitus Aventinum*

inseditis; haec, quae faenebres leges, haec, quae agrarias inpugnavit, haec conubia patrum et plebis interrupit, haec plebi ad curules magistratus iter obsaepsit. Personal and possessives yield fourteen examples, of which the larger number and most emphatic are, as we should expect in the speeches, pronouns of the second person, 7, 13, 10 cupimus . . . te duce vincere, tibi lauream insignem deferre, tecum triumphantes urbem inire, tuum sequentes currum Iovis optimi maximi templum gratantes ovantesque adire; 10, 8, 9; 23, 5, 14; 38, 48, 7; 40, 15, 10. Pronouns of the first person are found 3, 67, 11 adversus nos Aventinum capit, adversus nos occupatur mons . . . in nos viri, in nos armati estis; 28, 28, 11 quid? si ego morerer, mecum expiratura res publica, mecum casurum imperium populi Romani erat? 42, 41, 13 cum mei regni, meae dicionis essent.

Conditional particles appear thirty-seven times, their emphatic repetition enabling the speaker to enlarge on his theme by holding various facts and contingencies before his audience, as in 7, 40, 6 si meminisse vultis, non vos in Samnio nec in Volscis, . . . si illos colles, quos cernitis, patriae vestrae esse, si hunc exercitum civium vestrorum, si me consulem vestrum; 9, 9, 6 si spopondissemus urbem hanc relicturum populum Romanum si, incensurum, si magistratus, si senatum, si leges non habiturum, si sub regibus futurum. Noteworthy is 4, 5, 5, in which Canuleius states with increasing emphasis sundry conditions, the concession of which alone will induce the plebeians to accompany the consuls to war: si conubiis redditis unam hanc civitatem tandem facitis, si coalescere, si iungi miscerique vobis privatis necessitudinibus possunt, si spes, si aditus ad honores . . . datur, si in consortio, si in societate rei publicae esse, si . . . in vicem annuis magistratibus parere atque imperitare licet. Speakers find it necessary to give negative expression to their own purpose, will or policy, or to those of the opposition, hence negatives are freely used, and with nearly every part of speech. I have collected fifty-six examples, some quite extended, as non 5, 6, 17; 9, 1, 9; 28, 42, 6; 40, 10, 3; nec 9, 34, 22; 38, 49, 8 necubi notis sibi latebris delitescerent latrones Thraces, ne quid sarcinarum raperetur, ne quod iumentum ex tanto agmine abstraheretur, ne quis vulneraretur, ne ex vulnere vir fortis ac strenuus Q. Minucius moreretur; neu 25, 38, 6; nemo 4, 5, 6. Not infrequently various negatives are combined: 4, 4, 11; 5, 6, 8; 23, 9, 5; 37, 53, 18. Of other parts of speech

extended illustration is unnecessary. Adjectives total twenty-one instances, and those expressing quality are few. Note 23, 5, 10 itaque communem vos hanc cladem . . . credere, Campani, oportet, communem patriam tuendam arbitrari esse; 38, 17, 7 mollia corpora, molles, ubi ira consedit, animos sol pulvis sitis . . . prosternunt; 40, 15, 4 ut indignus te patre, indignus omnibus videar. Adjectives indicating quantity are more numerous, but on the whole a relatively small group:¹ tantus, 45, 39, 5; multus 42, 41, 11; quot 26, 41, 10; tot 30, 30, 7. Nouns in anaphora occur only six times, 6, 41, 4; 7, 35, 3; 21, 10, 10; 34, 4, 9; 36, 7, 18; 45, 38, 7. Adverbs, mostly of time or place, seventeen times. Verbs(fifteen examples) are best illustrated in 9, 8, 9; 25, 6, 22; 40, 9, 8. Prepositions are numerous: note sine 7, 13, 6; per 30, 12, 13; post 28, 43, 14. Conjunctions, as quod, quia, cum, ut, etc., are used twenty times, while temporal dum (28, 44, 10), comparative quam (5, 51, 7), and emphatic correlatives,² as seu (6, 41, 9), aut (32, 21, 15), partim (42, 41, 2) add forty-one instances.

Subdivisions of anaphora should be considered, such as the immediate repetition³ of the same word with emphasis or vehemence, 30, 14, 6 non est, non—mihi crede—tantum ab hostibus armatis aetati nostrae periculi, quantum ab circumfusis undique voluptatibus; likewise six instances in which there is a repetition of the last word, or some prominent word, at the beginning of the next sentence—frequently after intervening words and with an adjunct idea:⁴ 21, 44, 7 et, inde si

¹ I have not disregarded such examples as *omnia praemia ab se, omnes honores sperare*, as does Steele (l. c.) on the ground that such anaphora is dependent. For had no emphasis been intended, the writer would ordinarily have connected the nouns without repeating the common modifier, or would have inserted a conjunction, as in 21, 43, 3 *maiora vincula maioresque necessitates*.

² Omitted, of course, are stereotyped correlatives, as nec . . . nec, sive . . . sive, alii . . . alii, etc., where the first member requires the addition of a corresponding term.

³ Technically called *τελιπλογία* (Zon. Rhet. Gr., III, 165, 24; Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 182, 14); also *ἐπίστρεψις* (Herod. Rhet. Gr., III, 99, 22). Latin writers use the term *iteratio* (Aq. Rom. RLM., 31, 12) or *geminatio* (Carmen de Fig. RLM., 66, 76); cf. Quint., IX, 3, 28. This figure is frequent in Demosthenes, Cicero, and the Greek and Latin poets.

⁴ According to Quint. (IX, 3, 29) this kind is more effective than when the repeated word follows immediately, “*similis geminationis post*

decessero, in Africam transcendes. transcendes autem? ¹ transcendisse dico; 22, 59, 18 rediere Romam quondam remissi a Pyrrho sine pretio captivi; sed rediere cum legatis . . . redeam ego in patriam trecentis nummis non aestimatus civis? 22, 60, 15 liberi atque incolumes desiderate patriam; immo desiderate, dum patria est; 26, 13, 11 postremo ad moenia ipsa et ad portas accessit, Romam se adempturum eis, nisi omitterent Capuam, ostendit: non omiserunt; 5, 4, 10 et [bellum] perfici quam primum oportet. perficietur autem, si urgemos obsessos; 32, 21, 13 cur igitur nostrum ille auxilium absens petit potius quam praesens nos . . . tueatur? nos dico?

To sum up: the use of anaphora by individual speakers ranges from twenty-three examples by Demetrius (125 lines) to none by Decius Mus (53), Minucius (45), or the Saguntine embassy (55). It appears most frequently in speeches which show emphasis by vigorous amplification, and least frequently in those of simple progressive statement. Relative usage may be seen from the following: one example in every five and one-half lines (Demetrius); in seven (Torquatus); in eight (Postumius); in nine (Camillus, Hannibal, 21, 23-24, Sempronius, Scipio, 28, 27-29); in ten (Appius Claudius Crassus, Manlius, Perseus).

CHIASMUS.

Various collections showing Livy's use of this common figure² have already been made,³ but none with special refer-

aliquam interiectionem repetitio est, sed paulo etiam vehementior". It is defined by Ad Her. (IV, 28, 38) as *conduplicatio*, whose forcefulness is thus described: "Vehementer auditorem commouet eiusdem redintegratio uerbi et uulnus maius efficit in contrario causae, quasi aliquod telum saepius perueniat in eandem partem corporis." More frequently used is the term *ἀναδιπλωσις* (Zon. Rhet. Gr., III, 165, 29), or *ἐπανάληψις* (Phoeb. Rhet. Gr., III, 46, 29; Lupus, RLM., 8, 1).

¹ When the repetition, as here, is explanatory or corrective, it is called *ἐπιδιόρθωσις* (Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 62, 17), *ἐπιτίγμος* (Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 40, 21), *correctio* (Carmen de Fig. RLM., 69, 151).

² Grammatical chiasmus only, a reversal of the order of corresponding pairs, is here considered. For chiasmus used in logical expression of thought, cf. Nägelsbach (p. 634), and for definitions and illustrations of each type from the rhetoricians, see Steele, Chiasmus in Sallust, etc., J.H.U. Diss., 1891, p. 3 ff. See also Volkmann, p. 488.

³ See especially Steele (T.A.P.A., xxxii, pp. 166-185); Kühnast, p. 326 f.; Moczyński, p. 25. Haupt (pp. 56-84) discusses a few cases illustrating the figure both in the simple sentence and in extended periods.

ence to the speeches. In those examined I have noted numerous instances not elsewhere cited, especially examples in which, although the construction of corresponding pairs is not strictly parallel, the emphasis is quite obvious as in 5, 4, 7 *an ut aecum censes militia semenstri solidum te stipendum accipere?* 7, 13, 6 *priusquam expertus nos essemus, de nobis ita desperasti;* 40, 10, 9 *qui tuam senectutem obligatam et obnoxiam adolescentiae suae esse aequum censem.*

The general emphasis gained by chiasmus arises from juxtaposing, or separating terms, and so contrasting them by a reversal of the normal arrangement. The pairs most frequently so treated by Livy's speakers are made up of nouns with verbs. Note three pairs in 3, 68, 2 *visite agros . . . vastatos, praedam abigi, furnare incensa passim tecta;* 5, 6, 2; 26, 41, 15; 37, 53, 13 *rex Asiae . . . filiam suam in matrimonium mihi dabat; restituebat extemplo civitates, . . . spem magnam in posterum . . . faciebat;* 39, 36, 13 *qui . . . multitudinem exciverant, qui expugnaverant maritima oppida, . . . caudem principum fecerant;* 44, 38, 9 *longo itinere fatigatum et onere fessum, madentem sudore;* 45, 22, 6 *Athenae oppugnatae et Graecia in servitatem petita et adiutus Hannibal pecunia.* Two pairs are far more common (sixty-five examples). Illustrations are: 6, 18, 7 *ostendite modo bellum: pacem habebitis;* 22, 59, 6 *tunc demum pacti sumus pretium, . . . arma . . . hosti tradidimus;* 5, 6, 4 *tempestatibus captandis et observando tempore;* 34, 6, 17 *aut decrevit senatus aut populus iussit;* 40, 10, 1 *exsecrare nunc cupiditatem regni, et furias fraternalis concita;* 26, 41, 21; 45, 22, 11 *socios iuvare et . . . capessere bella.* Adjectives, adverbs, participles, and prepositional phrases are occasionally combined with verbs, as in 22, 39, 1 *si aut collegam, . . . tui similem, L. Aemili, haberetis aut tu collegae tui essemis similis;* 37, 53, 7 *in aliis rebus cessisse intra finem iuris mei cuilibet videri malim, quam nimis pertinaciter in obtinendo eo tetendisse;* 4, 3, 6 *cur . . . negent se manibus temperatueros violaturosque denuntient?* 45, 23, 3 *causam fortasse diceremus apud victorem, quem ad modum apud vos dicimus.*

Livy's speakers use chiasmus frequently with emphatic contrast of pronouns, particularly personal and possessive, of the first and second person. See 3, 67, 10 *victi nos aequiore animo*

quiescimus quam vos victores ; 4, 4, 12; 4, 5, 2; 5, 54, 3 etsi minus iniuriae vestrae quam meae calamitatis meminisse iuvat ; 6, 40, 8; 23, 9, 8; 28, 29, 3; 30, 30, 8; 30, 30, 18; 45, 23, 16. Observe the striking order in 7, 30, 23 proinde ut aut de vestris futuris sociis . . . aut nusquam ulla futuris nobis consulite. Noteworthy is 7, 40, 10 with pronouns in the means as also in the extremes, ergo vos prius in me strinxeritis ferrum quam in vos ego ; also 23, 5, 7, in which there is emphatic contrast of three pairs, but without corresponding construction in any : itaque non iuvetis nos in bello oportet, Campani, sed paene bellum pro nobis suscipiatis. The reverse order, in which pronouns are separated while members of other pairs are juxtaposed, may be seen in 10, 8, 4 non ut vos, Appi, vestro loco pellant, sed ut adiuvent vos homines plebei ; 26, 41, 21 nam et [illi] deseruntur ab sociis, ut prius ab Celtiberis nos ; 40, 10, 9 quoted above. Pronouns are used in chiasmus with nouns, as in 6, 40, 11 uti L. Sextium illum atque hunc Gaium Licinium consules, . . . videas ? 22, 29, 6 palam ferente Hannibale ab se Minucium, se ab Fabio victum ; 22, 39, 8 belli hoc genus, hostem hunc ignoro ; 28, 41, 4 nisi . . . aut illud bellum huic, aut victoria illa, etc. Occasionally the possessive is found opposed to the genitive of the noun, e. g. in 7, 13, 5 deum benignitate, felicitate tua populique Romani ; 45, 23, 1 deum benignitate et virtute vestra ; closely related to these are the following : 28, 42, 20 quam compar consilium tuum parentis tui consilio sit, reputa ; 3, 68, 5 non vestra virtute . . . sed auxilio alieno.

Nouns are well represented ; note three pairs in 23, 5, 11 Poenus hostis . . . ab ultimis terrarum oris, freto Oceani Herculisque columnis ; 39, 16, 8; 41, 24, 8; three pairs made up of nouns and adjectives : 44, 38, 9 cited above ; 44, 39, 1. Two pairs are frequent, as in 3, 67, 6 discordia ordinum . . . patrum ac plebis certamina ; 5, 52, 9; 8, 4, 4; 9, 9, 6; 9, 11, 5; 28, 27, 5; 28, 43, 5; 28, 43, 12; 28, 43, 18; 28, 48, 2; 30, 31, 2; 38, 48, 7; 39, 16, 1; 41, 23, 12; 41, 24, 3. Nouns with prepositional phrases are found in 37, 54, 26 et aliae [civitates] prius cum Philippo, et cum Pyrrho Tarentini.

Adverbs arranged chiastically are rare : 21, 44, 4 ad suppli-
cium deposcerunt me ducem primum, deinde vos omnes ;

34, 2, 7; 36, 17, 13 a Philippo ante nunc ab Aetolis ; 39, 37, 15 parum est victis, quod victoribus satis est. Only the following clauses were found, a relatively small group : 5, 54, 3; 27, 13, 5 omitto ea, quibus gloriari potestis ; cuius et ipsius pudere ac paenitere vos oportet, referam ; 28, 29, 4; 30, 30, 21; 32, 21, 5; 34, 4, 16; 39, 36, 13 f.

The total number of examples under review is 166. No specific statement as to desirable frequency is available, but considering the number and extent of the speeches examined we may conclude that Livy here kept in mind rhetorical precept (cf. Quint., IX, 100)—that figures to be embellishments must be used judiciously and in moderation. Individual speakers showing greatest relative frequency in usage are: Calavius, Capitolinus, P. Scipio (26, 41), Hannibal (30, 30), Q. Fabius (22, 39), Camillus, Astymedes.

PARONOMASIA.

This figure belongs to a general class, which, by some resemblance, opposition or equality, appeals to the ear and attention of the hearer.¹ In paronomasia the same or related word, or a word similar in sound, is purposely used in a different sense or construction, to give an antithetical force to the sentence.

¹ See Quint., IX, 3, 66; Schem. Dian. RLM., 75, 12. The term *ταπερομαιλία*, not used by Aristotle, is met frequently in the Rhet. Gr. (see Spengel's index). In Latin it is denominatio (Schem. Dian., l. c.), adnominatio, or adfictio; see Rufin. RLM., 51, 23; Ad Her., IV, 21-22. Quint. (l. c.) confines the figure principally to a repetition of words with change in case or tense, or to instances in which the same word is repeated with changed or added meaning. Word plays, where the point consists in conscious changes in sound, quantity of vowels, prepositional compounds, etc., frequent in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Seneca Rhetor, are quite rare in Livy. Kühnast (p. 330) treats under iteratio and limits the figure to an arrangement of words derived from the same stem and similar in form. Repetition with change, even in Livy, is of wide application, frequently the same word being repeated with variation only in case or tense. Unless emphasis is clearly intentional all such occurrences are here neglected, since they must be regarded as accidental, unavoidable without artificiality, or at least in harmony with a principle common to all languages—the disposition to continue and enlarge an idea by some form of repetition. For a more detailed treatment of paronomasia, see I. M. Casanowicz, Paronomasia in the Old Testament, Boston, 1894 (J. H. U. Diss.).

It is relatively infrequent in the historians.¹ To examples from Livy already collected,² many additions are here made, with omission of such as are involved in anaphora and in the use of correlatives.

Words of the same stem are repeated in 3, 68, 8 *sedemus* *desides domi*; 4, 4, 11 *nec eodem itinere eat*; 5, 4, 1 *de ipsa condicione dicere*; 5, 5, 2 *agrum non coluit, et culta evastata sunt bello*; 5, 6, 10 *inxpugnabiles [urbes] . . . tempus ipsum vincit atque expugnat, sicut Veios expugnabit*; 5, 54, 7 *ubi quondam capite humano invento responsum est eo loco caput rerum . . . fore*; 9, 9, 15 *ut, . . . et nostrum exercitum eadem, quae impedierat, fortuna expediret, vanam victoriam vanior irritam faceret pax*; 21, 43, 14 *cum exercitu tirone, . . . ignoto adhuc duci suo ignorantique ducem*; 21, 43, 18 *adversus ignotos inter se ignorantesque*; 22, 39, 5 *adversus Hannibalem . . . pugnandum tibi sit, Varro dux . . . te sit oppugnaturus*; 25, 38, 5 *me . . . curis insomniisque agitant et excitant saepe somno*; 29, 17, 2 *magis indignemini bonis ac fidelibus sociis tam indignas iniurias . . . fieri*; 30, 12, 18 *amore captivae victor captus*; 34, 5, 1; 37, 53, 7 *in obtinendo eo tetendisse*; 37, 54, 6 *ut nos liberi etiam aliorum libertatis causam agamus*; 38, 17, 13 *est generosius, in sua quidquid sede dignitur; insitum alienae terrae . . . degenerat*; 38, 49, 8 *necubi notis sibi latebris delitescerent latrones*; 40, 8, 16 *neque vos . . . eventus detergere a vecordi discordia potuit*; 41, 24, 15; 42, 42, 8. In two cases we have emphatic change of prepositional compound: 31, 29, 15 *eiusdem linguae homines . . . causae diiungunt coniunguntque*; 40, 12, 6 *quae obest potius quam prodest*.

More frequently the same word is used, but as involving an emphatic change in some particular, e. g. in construction: 6, 18, 8 *ego quidem nulli vestrum deero: ne fortuna mea desit*; 6, 18, 13 *experimini modo et vestram felicitatem et me . . . feliciter expertum: minore negotio qui imperet patribus imponetis, quam qui resisterent imperantibus imposuistis*; 9, 4, 9; 9, 4, 14; 21, 40, 11 *decuit . . . deos . . . committere ac profligare bellum, nos . . . commissum ac profligatum conficere*; 25, 38, 15 *ne*

¹ Draeger, *Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (3 ed.), p. 110; Lupus, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos*, Berlin, 1876, p. 199.

Petzke, p. 72 f.; Moczyński, p. 22.

. . . ipsi oppugnati castra sua ultro oppugnemus. audeamus, quod credi non potest ausuros nos; 26, 41, 9; 27, 13, 3 quos vincendo et victos sequendo; 28, 39, 2 bellum propter nos suscepistis, susceptum . . . geritis; 28, 40, 14 vincere ego prohibui Hannibalem, ut a vobis . . . vinci posset; 36, 7, 14; 37, 54, 18 nec terra mutata mutavit genus; 40, 9, 15 si deprehensos . . . ad te deducerem, rem pro manifesto haberet: fatentes pro deprehensis habe. Change in case: 6, 40, 18 parum est, si, cuius pars tua nulla adhuc fuit, in partem eius venis, nisi partem petendo totum traxeris? 8, 4, 8; 9, 9, 11; 9, 34, 1; 10, 8, 5 cuius tam dictatoris magister equitum quam magistri equitum dictator esse potes; 21, 10, 4 si ex bellis bella serendo; 21, 40, 4; 22, 39, 1; 28, 28, 15; 31, 29, 16 hoc eodem loco iidem homines de eiusdem Philippi pace . . . iisdem improbabibus eam pacem Romanis; 32, 21, 29; 38, 17, 8; 39, 37, 9; 40, 13, 3. Change in tense: 23, 9, 8 valeant preces apud te meae, sicut pro te hodie valuerunt; 30, 31, 5 ius fasque dederunt et . . . dant et dabunt; 34, 4, 16; 40, 9, 14 possunt quidem omnia audere qui hoc ausi sunt.

The simplest form of paronomasia is the so-called *σχῆμα ἐτυμολογικόν*, involving repetition of the same or a kindred stem in dependent relation.¹ It is rare in classic Latin authors with the exception of a few formal expressions maintained through all periods, but more frequent in Sallust and Livy.² I have noted the following in Livy's speeches: 7, 30, 20 adnuite . . . numen; 9, 9, 13 sponsio . . . quam populi iussu spopondissemus; 9, 11, 7 pacem . . . pepigistis; 9, 11, 9; 31, 29, 16; 38, 48, 10; 38, 48, 11; 28, 40, 3 scio . . . rem actam hodierno die agi; 28, 43, 10 occidione occisi; 36, 17, 13 liberatam [Graeciam] liberare; 37, 54, 19 certare pio certamine.

To be considered also under paronomasia is alliteration, which differs from figura etymologica in that the former has to do

¹ Diomed. Gr. Lat., I, p. 446: "cum praecedenti nomini aut verbum aut nomen adnectitur ex eodem figuratu"; Rufin. RLM., 57, 30. A comprehensive study for Latin has been made by Landgraf (Acta Sem. Erlang., II, 1-69), who defines (p. 8): "est igitur figura etymologica compositio duorum congenitorum vocabulorum, quae item grammaticae legibus arctissime inter se conexa unam eamque amplificatam atque disertissimam notionem efficiant".

² Wölfflin, A. L. L., VI, p. 448; Landgraf, op. cit., p. 4: Draeger, Synt. und Stil, etc., p. 22.

with a combination of words not generically related or grammatically dependent.¹ It is used with great frequency by Roman archaic writers,² and while many cases of intentional alliteration³ are found in the great prose writers, it cannot be called a striking stylistic feature of any except Nepos,⁴ Sallust,⁵ Cicero,⁶ and Tacitus.⁷ No study has as yet been made of usage in Livy's speeches, in which occurrences in the restricted sense⁸ are fairly frequent, e. g. 3, 67, 5 *fusi fugatique*; 3, 68, 13; 28, 43, 14; 28, 28, 9 *fudi fugavi*; 32, 21, 19; 38, 17, 15; 21, 44, 2 *fidelissimos fortissimosque*; 37, 54, 28 *forti fidelique*; 22, 60,

¹ Landgraf, op. cit., p. 3: "cuius [alliterationis] natura haec est, ut duo vel plura deinceps vocabula quae tamen nullis grammaticae legibus inter se coniunguntur, ab iisdem litteris aut syllabis initium capiant". The term alliteration is used first by the Italian humanist Pontanus (1426-1503); see Norden, I, p. 59 note. However, the Romans were fully conscious that they used this rhetorical device; cf. Ad Her., IV, 12, 18 ("eiusdem litterae nimiam adsiduitatem"); Servius (on Aen., III, 183). Donat. (on Ter. Eun., 780) and Char. (Gr. Lat., I, p. 282) call the figure παρόμιων. The Greek name is δημοιάρκτος according to a Scholium of Maximus. Planudes on Hermogenes (Rh. Gr. V 511, 6 Walz). The phenomenon in popular language and in religious and legal usage precedes any regular literature (see Tracy Peck, Alliteration in Latin, T.A.P.A., XV, pp. 58-65). Wölfflin (Zur Alliteration, Mélanges Boissier, Paris, 1903, p. 461 ff.) concludes that the Greeks did not recognize alliteration in the Latin sense.

² Wölfflin (Zur Alliteration, A.L.L., IX, p. 573); Peck (l. c.).

³ Frequency depends, of course, on the conception of the figure. Some regard it as the recurrence of the same or initial letter (or its phonetic equivalent) in two or more contiguous words, whatever their relation; see citations by Lahmeyer, Die Allit. in Ciceros Pompeiana, Progr., Görlitz, 1891, pp. 1-14, and definition p. 3. So in this wide sense examples by Petzke, pp. 75-77; Drenckhahn, Lat. Stilistik, Berlin, 1896, p. 84; Wichert, Lat. Stillehre, Königsberg, 1856, pp. 420, 430, 512. Such a principle makes no distinction between accidental and intentional alliteration, nor between the avoidable and practically unavoidable juxtaposition of alliterative words. In the sense used in Wölfflin's comprehensive and authoritative study (Die allit. Verbind., München, 1881, p. 7) restriction is made to combinations of similar elements, or to members which are syntactically coordinate.

⁴ See Pretzsch, Zur Stilistik des Corn. Nepos, Progr., Spandau, 1890; Lupus, op. cit., p. 199.

⁵ Gerstenberg, Ueber die Reden bei Sallust, Progr., Berlin, 1892, p. 16.

⁶ Especially in his earlier works; see Laurand, Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron, p. 113; Bossier (l. c.).

⁷ Gudeman, Dialogus de Orat., Boston, 1894, p. xlviii; Petzke, p. 73.

⁸ See note 3 above.

20 fortia fidelia; 5, 51, 10 foedus ac fidem fefellerunt; 5, 52, 1 culpae cladisque; 7, 30, 20, nutum numenque; 7, 30, 23 lucem ac libertatem; 31, 29, 4 licentiam an levitatem; 39, 15, 1 ludum et lasciviam; 7, 35, 6 videntem ac vigilantem; 21, 41, 17 vis virtusque; 25, 38, 10; 22, 39, 19 vanam . . . veram; 41, 23, 17; 9, 34, 12 stolidos ac socordes; 10, 8, 12 faustum felixque; 21, 10, 11 furiam facemque; 21, 41, 10 indignatione atque ira; 22, 14, 8 oculos atque ora; 44, 38, 9 ore atque oculis; 22, 14, 14 audendo atque agendo; 22, 39, 20; 22, 39, 10 sede ac solo; 22, 39, 14 fame quam ferro; 22, 39, 22 clara certaque; 22, 39, 20 timidum pro cauto tardum pro considerato; 22, 59, 16 suspensi ac solliciti; 25, 38, 8 vivunt vigentesque; 26, 13, 14 cruciatus contumeliasque; 26, 41, 12 integra atque immobilis; 26, 41, 18 auguriis auspiciisque; 27, 13, 5 pudere ac paenitere; 28, 27, 8 tacta tractataque; 28, 28, 10 amolior et amoveo; 28, 29, 7 satis superque; 30, 12, 16 oro obtestorque; 32, 21, 17 terrore ac tumultu; 34, 3, 5 destruet ac demolietur; 39, 16, 10 demolientes dissentientes; 34, 7, 9 gaudent et gloriantur; 34, 7, 14 seditionem et secessionem; 36, 17, 12 provisum atque praecautum; 36, 7, 6 prius potiusque; 38, 49, 11 ceciderunt cuperunt; 39, 16, 5 flagitium et facinus; 39, 37, 7 corpus et concilium; 39, 37, 16 sancta atque sacrata; 40, 13, 7 certamine et concursu; 44, 22, 11 superbum . . . sapientem; 45, 23, 10 superbia . . . stultitia; 44, 22, 12 prudentibus et peritis; 45, 39, 16 maledice ac maligne. In 38, 17, 5, insolita atque insueta, there is the emphasis of a double alliteration (prep. and stem). Effective also in their appeal to the ear are combinations whose members begin with the same preposition (neglected by Wölfflin), as 3, 68, 4 reddent ac restituent; 5, 5, 7 intermissiones . . . intervallaque; 25, 38, 15 obsessi . . . atque oppugnati; 26, 41, 7 transeamus transferamusque; 39, 16, 8 conquererent comburerent; 40, 8, 7 conficti aut commissi; 37, 53, 27 decadere et deducere; 38, 48, 3 indixit aut intulit; 40, 10, 9 obligatam obnoxiam; 40, 11, 3 imbuti et infecti. Repetition of a negative compound is generally not an artistic device, as this method of expressing the lack of two qualities is natural, and, sometimes, unavoidable. The following seem to be used for emphasis: 9, 4, 12 inbellis atque inermis; 44, 38, 10 iners atque imbellis; 38, 47, 10 infamia atque invidia; 40, 11, 9 incertae . . . inanes.

Finally, of alliteration in the wider sense may be noted a few striking examples, in which, had no emphasis been felt, we

may assume changes in order and phraseology would have been made: 3, 67, 7 *tribunos . . . concupistis: concordiae causa concessimus. decemviros desiderastis*, etc.; 3, 68, 1 *ubi hic curiam circumsederitis et forum infestum feceritis et carcerem impleveritis principibus*; 6, 18, 14 *proinde adeste, prohibete ius . . . dici. ego me patronum profiteor plebis*; 9, 9, 11 *et illi male partam victoriam male perdiderunt*; 9, 11, 8 *hoc fide . . . foederibus . . . fetialibus caerimoniis dignum erat*; 9, 11, 9 *quod petisti per pactionem*; 21, 40, 2 *hunc hostem secutus confessionem cedentis ac detractantis certamen . . . habui*; 28, 29, 1 *revocavit tamen a publico parricidio privata pietas*; 30, 31, 9 *bellum parate, quoniam pacem pati non potuistis*; 34, 2, 4 *si coetus et concilia et secretas consultationes esse sinas*; 34, 4, 13 *pessimus quidem pudor est vel parsimoniae vel paupertatis*; 39, 16, 1 *si . . . a facinoribus manus, mentem a fraudibus abstinuissent*; 40, 11, 2 *clandestina concocta sunt consilia*.

Livy uses paronomasia to make certain groups of words especially prominent and effective, and uses it more freely with speakers of circumspection and experience. Hence Q. Fabius in his speech of caution to Paulus uses eleven examples; Scipio, 21, 40-41, five, 28, 27-29, six, Manlius, five.

ASYNDETON.

This figure, a favorite with orators,¹ is aptly used to impart vivacity, energy, vehemence.² In Livy³ it occurs very fre-

¹ Aristotle (*Rhet.* III, 12, 2 f.) says it is well suited to practical eloquence (*λέξις διγνωστική*), ill suited to written style (*λέξις γραφική*), because when unsupported by delivery the *δούνδεται* fail in the proper effect, i. e. intonation must come into play to prevent their being felt as all one, of the same character and accent. Further, by their use many things appear to be said at the same time, on the principle that connecting particles unite several items into one, whereas by the omission of connections one becomes many. Hence *δούνδεται* amplify, since the auditor seems to survey a number of items given. So Quint. (IX, 3, 50): "nam et singula inculcantur et quasi plura fiunt." Latin terms are: articulus (*Ad Her.*, IV, 19, 26) of the omission of conjunctions between single words, dissolutum (IV, 30, 41) of the same between clauses; solutum (*Aq. Rom. RLM.*, 35, 9; *Capella, RLM.*, 482, 19); dissolutio (Quint., l. c.); dissolutio vel inconexio (*Rufin. RLM.*, 53, 1).

² Quint. (l. c.); Tib. *Rhet. Gr.*, III, 77, 27; *Ad Her.*, IV, 30, 41: "Hoc genus [dissolutum] et acrimoniam habet in se et uehementis-

quently and in every variety. I have counted 546 examples in the speeches, excluding those involving anaphora, and limiting them to members of a single period.¹

The earliest form is the so-called asyndeton sollempne in stereotyped formulae.² Omitting 44 examples of the official combination, patres conscripti, and 6 of optimus maximus, both in use from the earliest period, Livy has few instances. Note 5, 5, 6 novus de integro; 22, 60, 20 fortia fidelia; 28, 39, 8 ex insperato repente; 39, 15, 11 forte temere; 44, 28, 8 terra mari; note also, in legal process, 9, 4, 16 ite, consules, redimite; 9, 11, 13 i, licitor, deme.

Asyndeton enumerativum is by far the largest class. Of individual words, nouns may be illustrated, by seven members in 26, 13, 13 Roma, coniuges, liberi, arae, foci, delubra, sepulcra; by six, 30, 14, 9 ipse, coniunx, regnum, ager, oppida, homines; by five, 5, 54, 4 locum, colles, flumen, mare, locum; 9, 9, 6; 38, 17, 3; by four, 3, 67, 9 auxilium, provocationem, scita plebis, iura; 22, 39, 11 armis viris equis commeatibus; 26, 13, 18; 28, 27, 4; 28, 43, 12; 34, 3, 7; 40, 10, 7; 41, 23, 10; 44, 22, 13; 44, 39, 1; by three, 3, 68, 5 odia offendentes similitates; 3, 68, 11; 4, 4, 3; 4, 4, 4; 5, 5, 11; 6, 41, 9; 7, 30, 19; 9, 9, 8; 22, 59, 15; 28, 42, 12; 28, 44, 5; 29, 17, 15; 29, 17, 18; 32, 21, 21; 34, 2, 11; 34, 7, 11; 38, 17, 7; 38, 17, 17; 38, 45, 10; 39, 16, 7; 39, 16, 8; 40, 13, 3; 40, 13, 4; 45, 23, 5; 45, 39, 5; by two, 3, 68, 4 re fortuna; 4, 3, 12; 4, 4, 2, etc. Proper names also are used effectively, as in 28, 28, 12 Flaminio, Paulo, Graccho, Postumio Albino, M. Marcello, T. Quinctio Crispino, Cn. Fulvio, Scipioni-

simum est et ad breuitatem accommodatum." See also Longinus, *Περὶ Τύπους*, XX.

¹ The most important collections are given by Kühnast, p. 284 ff., and Draeger, *Hist. Synt.*, II, pp. 190-212. See also Moczyński, pp. 22-23; M. Müller, *Sprachgebrauch des Livius*, Progr., Stendal, 1866, p. 3 ff.; Preuss, *De bimembris dissoluti apud scriptores. Rom. usu sollemni*, Edenkoben, 1881, passim.

² Following Nägelebach (p. 656 note): "wir verstehen unter den Gliedern lediglich die der Struktur und grammatischen Geltung nach gleichartigen Satz- oder Periodenteile."

³ Cf. Preuss, op. cit., p. 7: "paulatim in vulgi consuetudinem ac proverbium eaque δούρδετως posita venerunt, ita ut procedente tempore prorsus vel certe plus minusve neglecta esse videatur coniunctio, quasi omnino non pertineat ad tales locutiones."

bus meis, tot tam praeclaris imperatoribus uno bello absumptis ; 30, 30, 25 Sicilia, Sardinia, Hispania, quidquid insularum, etc. Notable is the case of Scipio, 26, 41, 10 f., recalling Roman victories following Roman defeats: vetera omitto, Porsinam, Gallos, Samnites . . . Trebia, Trasumennus, Cannae . . . adde defectionem Italiae, Siciliae maioris partis, Sardiniae. Three names are found : 3, 17, 3; 4, 3, 16; 31, 29, 10; 31, 29, 15; 37, 53, 24; 38, 17, 11; 38, 46, 4; 45, 24, 9; two names : 9, 8, 8; 26, 41, 15; 26, 41, 16; 28, 28, 6; 28, 28, 15; 28, 41, 13; 38, 17, 8; 40, 8, 15 (two pairs) ; 45, 22, 11; 45, 39, 2; 45, 39, 7. Adjectives in asyndeton are infrequent. Only the following were found : 22, 39, 12 meliores prudentiores constantiores ; 40, 12, 6 circumventum solum inopem ; 45, 39, 5 aurea marmorea eburnea ; 9, 34, 18 antiquior . . . sancta ; 22, 60, 30 quoted above ; 37, 53, 21 extorris expulsus ; 44, 38, 8 requietum, integrum ; 5, 4, 5 tot tam ; 26, 13, 17; 28, 28, 42. Verbs are not numerous but there are some striking examples, as in 29, 17, 15 omnes rapiunt, spoliant, verberant, vulnerant, occidunt, constuprant matronas, virgines, ingenuos raptos ex complexu parentium ; 38, 48, 4 regna augetis donatis adimitis, curae vestrae censem est esse ; 5, 5, 8 irati sunt, oderunt, negant misuros ; 9, 8, 7 scribere armare educere ; 28, 28, 9 fudi, fugavi, Hispania expuli ; 38, 46, 6 caesi, fugati, exuti impedimentis sumus ; 40, 11, 8 Romani laetabuntur, probabunt, defendant factum. Clauses and phrases in enumerative asyndeton, usually of two members, but extending to five (25, 6, 20; 9, 11, 4) and even to seven (5, 4, 13), are far too numerous for citation. However, a few instances will be given of asyndeton showing a quick succession of acts in a description¹ and intended to convey the idea of haste, speed, decision, etc., as 9, 1, 5 res hostium in praeda captas, . . . remisimus : auctores belli, . . . dedidimus ; bona eorum, . . . Romam portavimus ; 21, 41, 11 veniam dedimus precantibus, emisimus ex obsidione, pacem cum victis fecimus, tutelae deinde nostrae duximus ; 28, 27, 15 in praetorio tetenderunt Albius et Atrius, classicum apud eos cecinit, signum ab iis petitum est, sederunt in tribunali P. Scipionis, lictor apparuit, summoto incesserunt, fasces cum

¹ Called by Nägelsbach (p. 746) "Das achte Asyndeton"; by Draeger (Hist. Synt., II, p. 209) "Das beschleunigende Asyndeton."

securibus praelati sunt; see also 28, 42, 3; 34, 6, 11 f.; 42, 13, 6 f.

Variety in enumerations is obtained where asyndeton is followed by coordinating particles: 3, 17, 5 consules tribunos deos hominesque; 6, 41, 9 tradamus ancilia penetralia deos deorumque curam; 7, 30, 23 salutem victoriam lucem ac libertatem; 26, 41, 14 secunda, prospera, in dies laetiora ac meliora; 28, 42, 11 moenia patriae, templa deum, aras et focos; 39, 15, 9 fanatici vigiliis, vino, strepitibus clamoribusque nocturnis attoniti. Occasionally the asyndeton is broken within the series by the connecting of two elements which are naturally associated, as in 23, 5, 6 legiones equitatus arma signa equi virique pecunia commeatus. The best example of asyndeton and particles used together is 21, 40, 9 effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inluvie squalore enecti, contusi ac debilitati inter saxa rupesque; ad hoc praeusti artus, nive rigentes nervi, membra torrida gelu, quassata fractaque arma, claudi ac debiles equi. Less frequently asyndeton is preceded by connectives, e. g. 28, 44, 15 terror fugaque, populatio agrorum, defectio sociorum, ceterae belli clades; 40, 8, 11 se stirpemque suam, domos, regna. For variety asyndeton and polysyndeton are occasionally united in the same sentence: 3, 67, 5 castris exuti, agro multati, sub iugum missi, et se et vos novere; 7, 13, 5 nobis deum benignitate, felicitate tua populique Romani et res et gloria est integra; 10, 7, 9 sellis curulibus, toga praetexta, tunica palmata et toga picta et corona triumphali laureaque.

Asyndeton adversativum¹ is found everywhere in the speeches, hence few illustrations will be given: 4, 5, 4 animos vestros illi temptabunt semper, vires non experientur; 9, 4, 14 quas [spes opesque] servando patriam servamus, dedendo ad necem patriam deserimus; 28, 27, 4 corpora, ora, vestitum, habitum civium adgnosco; facta, dicta, consilia, animos hostium video; 45, 39, 16 non enim de bello deliberatis, . . . , quod inferre potestis, gerere non potestis. Explanatory asyndeton (asynd. explicativum), in which the two members stand in a kind of apposition, is much less frequent. The second member may give not only an explanation or reason, but an infer-

¹ Draeger, Hist. Synt., II, p. 202; Synt. und Stil, p. 56; Nägelsbach, p. 738; Kühnast, p. 287.

ence, or a logical conclusion. See 3, 68, 3 at *enim communis res per haec loco est peiore: ager uritur, urbs obsidetur, belli gloria penes hostis est*; 5, 51, 8; 5, 52, 8; 7, 30, 9; 7, 35, 4; 7, 40, 10; 9, 9, 10; 21, 43, 4; 22, 39, 9; 29, 18, 13; 29, 18, 16; 34, 2, 7; 34, 4, 8; 38, 17, 7; 38, 46, 11; 39, 15, 7; 40, 11, 9; 45, 23, 11; 45, 23, 14; 45, 24, 9; 4, 4, 8 *nemo plebeius patriciae virgini vim adferret: patriciorum ista lubido est*; 9, 34, 21; 21, 43, 11; 21, 44, 9; 22, 39, 9; 25, 6, 16; 26, 13, 14; 27, 13, 2; 28, 27, 8; 28, 42, 7; 29, 18, 10; 31, 29, 14; 34, 5, 12; 38, 17, 18; 39, 46, 1; 40, 10, 5; 40, 11, 8; 42, 42, 6; 42, 42, 9; 5, 4, 7 *annua aera habes, annuam operam ede*; 6, 18, 8 *ego quidem nulli vestrum deero: ne fortuna mea desit, videte*; 7, 40, 2; 9, 9, 18; 10, 8, 6; 22, 60, 20; 25, 6, 21; 26, 13, 16; 28, 29, 4; 28, 41, 9; 28, 42, 1; 28, 42, 17; 29, 18, 19; 32, 21, 29; 40, 9, 15; 40, 15, 8. Included here also are some forty instances of parenthesis, explanatory in purpose and frequently taking the place of a subordinate clause, e. g. in 4, 4, 1 *nullane res nova institui debet, et, quod nondum est factum—multa enim nondum sunt facta in novo populo—ea, ne si utilia quidem sunt, fieri oportet?* Asyndeton summativum,¹ which gives the result of a series, “in short,” is well illustrated by 28, 42, 6 *ubi non portus ullus classi nostrae apertus, non ager pacatus, non civitas socia, non rex amicus, non consistendi usquam locus, non procedendi; quacumque circumspexeris, hostilia omnia atque infesta*; see also such examples as 6, 41, 10; 9, 34, 22; 26, 13, 13; 38, 17, 5; 45, 39, 3 *et vos Gentium quam Persea duci in triumpho mavultis, Quirites, et de accessione potius belli quam de bello triumphari? et legiones ex Illyrico laureatae urbem inibunt et navales socii: Macedonicae legiones suo abrogato triumphos alienos spectabunt?*

To summarize: asyndeton is to be found in practically every speech, but as indicative of rapid, forceful presentation, of vehemence which sets order aside, it is used relatively most

¹ Cf. Nägelsbach (p. 740); Kühnast, p. 284: “Das abschliessende As. (nicht glücklich summativum von Nägelsbach genannt”); Draeger, Hist. Synt., II, p. 206: “Das Asynd. summ. besteht theils aus einzelnen Wörtern, die eine Reihe von Begriffen zusammenfassen, gleichsam summiren, theils aus einem ganzen Satze, durch welchen das Ergebniss einer Gedankenreihe kurz angegeben wird.” All Livy’s examples noted are of clauses.

often by Cn. Manlius, Scipio, Q. Fabius, Capitolinus, and Astymedes.

POLYSYNDETON.

This figure is like asyndeton in that each is a coacervatio, but unlike it in that conjunctions are present.¹ It is employed freely in the speeches, and with but little variety, *et* being found most often, whether connecting words, or phrases, or clauses. Two members are usual, but occasionally more are found, as 37, 54, 11 nam et Lycaonia et Phrygia utraque et Pisidia omnis et Chersonesus; 21, 41, 2 ubi et fratrem . . . socium haberem et Hasdrubalem . . . hostem et minorem haud dubie molem belli; 22, 60, 26 et castra et arma et vos ipsos traditis hosti; 31, 29, 7; 34, 2, 11; 28, 44, 6; 29, 18, 1 et nos queri . . . et vos audire et exsolvere rempublicam; 29, 18, 18 et nunc et tunc et saepe; 30, 31, 6; 37, 54, 13; 38, 48, 11; 40, 14, 11. Variations with -que, atque, etc. occur as 5, 54, 3 colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum; 36, 7, 2 cum de Euboea deque Achaeis et de Boeotia agebatur; 36, 7, 4; 5, 51, 3 dique et homines; 5, 51, 10; 21, 41, 7; 21, 43, 9; 22, 14, 12; 25, 38, 7; 26, 13, 15; 29, 17, 12, 13, 20; 30, 12, 12; 36, 7, 16; 36, 17, 5; 37, 53, 12; 38, 45, 9; 41, 24, 2; 25, 6, 9 et consuli primoribusque aliis; 40, 9, 1 et armati . . . accipiendi, praebendumque ferro iugulum. Occasionally still other combinations: 5, 51, 8 victi captique ac redempti; 25, 6, 15 illis arma tantum atque ordo militandi locusque.

Polysyndeton is found in nearly all the speeches studied. Of the more extended speeches it is relatively most frequent in those by the Locrian embassy, Capitolinus, Hannibal (36, 7), L. Valerius, Cato, Cn. Manlius (38, 47-49), and Camillus. So little variety is observable in the usage as a whole that no conclusion can be drawn as to its prominence in the speeches here mentioned.

¹Cf. Quint., IX, 3, 53 sq.: Sed utrumque coacervatio et tantum iuncta aut dissoluta. . . . Fons quidem unus, quia acriora facit et instanter, quae dicimus, et vim quandam prae se ferentia velut saepius erumpentis affectus. Volkmann, p. 474: "macht durch die ausgedrückte Häufung die Rede würdevoll und grossartig, und lässt auch wohl das kleine und unbedeutende grösser und bedeutamer erscheinen, als es in Wirklichkeit ist." Latin writers ordinarily use the Greek term, but we find multiiugum (Carmen de Fig., RLM., 65, 52).

By way of summary the following table is given to show Livy's varying usage in the rhetorical elements studied, passing from the earlier to the later parts of his work.

Decade.	Sententiae.	Interrogation.	Irony.	Climax.	Apostrophe and Exclamation.	Antithesis.	Hyperbole.	Anaphora.	Chiasmus.	Paronomasia.	Asyndeton.	Polysyndeton.	Total.	Average each Teubner page.
I. (35 pp.) ...	10	99	22	21	25	58	5	118	57	38	146	30	629	18
III. (43 pp.) ...	14	62	8	12	13	22	9	106	52	60	180	51	589	13 +
IV. (38 pp.) ...	17	60	6	5	10	17	1	81	37	47	122	68	471	12 +
V. (25 pp.) ...	3	72	7	1	5	3	0	71	20	20	98	30	330	13 +
Total	44	293	43	39	53	100	15	376	166	165	546	179	2019	14 +

A glance at the above table makes it clear that the occurrence of all figures is approximately one and one-half times as great in the first as it is in any one of the succeeding decades; also that with respect to seven of these figures, Irony, Climax, Apostrophe and Exclamation, Antithesis, Anaphora, Chiasmus, Asyndeton, each is more frequent in the first than in any of the later decades. In but three figures, Sententiae, Paronomasia, Polysyndeton, is the relative occurrence greater in the third or fourth than in the first decade, a reason for which in the case of the first two figures is advanced in the discussion given above. In Interrogation only is the relative frequency in the fifth equal to that of the first, while in Polysyndeton alone is it greater than that of the first.

From this variation it seems to be a reasonable conclusion that Livy's rhetorical dexterity was allowed freer scope in the first decade as a means of giving life, color, and emphasis to the remote and uncertain events with which he had to deal, resulting withal in a concitatus orationis genus well adapted to the impassioned orators whom Livy associates with Rome's early political and social struggles.

H. V. CANTER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

IV.—OATHS IN THE GREEK EPISTOLOGRAPHERS.

Though many¹ have investigated the oaths used in Greek comedy, dialogue, and oratory, the oaths used by the epistolographers seem never to have been studied in a comprehensive way.² In compiling the following list from Hercher's collection, an effort has been made to eliminate all curses, wishes, prayers, everything save genuine oaths, with the result that a considerable number of invocations, especially in the vocative, have been excluded.

OATHS BY THE GODS COLLECTIVELY (79).

μὰ τὸν θεόν (22) : Aen. 5; Aesch. 5. 1, 9. 2, 12. 16; Alciph. 2. 4. 17; Aristaen. I. 28; Demos. 5. 3; Jul. 9. 6, 58. 6, 58. 15; Phalar. 31, 68, 95. 2, 119. 1, 124, 128, 131, 133, 137; Procop. 102, 116, 140. *μὰ τὸν θεόν τὸν σωτῆρας*: Jul 58. 24. *μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν ἄλλους θεούς*: Aesch. II. 6. *νὴ θεόν*: Aristaen. I. 4. *νὴ τὸν θεόν* (14): Alciph. 2. 3. 3 (Menander); Aristaen. I. 28; Hippoc. 17. 2; Jul. 6, 22. 2, 50. 2, 58. 19, 58. 21, 68. 1; Phalar. 125, 132; Plato 7. 349; Procop. 30; Synes. 104. 244c. *πρὸς θεῶν* (15): Aristaen. I. 5, I. 6, I. 22, 2. 1, 2. 4, 2. 7, 2. 15; Diog. 36, 4; Hippoc. 17. 23; Phalar. 142. 2; Procop. 101; Theophyl. 8, 12, 21, 23. *πρὸς τῶν θεῶν* (2): Alciph. 2. 2. 8; Jul. 58. 4. *πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων*: Alciph. 3. 39. 1. *πρὸς Διός τε ἵκεσίου καὶ θεῶν δύμογρίων*: Hippoc. 26. *πρὸς Διός ἔενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν*: Demos. 5. 1. *ὦ θεοί* (8): Aesch. 12. 3; Alciph. 3. 50. 3, 3. 61. 3, 3. 72. 1; Jul. 26. 2; Phalar. 141. 2, 141. 3; Philostrat. 73. 3 (Gorgias 12). *ὦ θεοί καὶ δάιμονες οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἐν*

¹Cf. the author's Princeton diss. (1910), Studies in Menander, Chapter I, Oaths in Menander, with the bibliography there cited. The most important collections of material are to be found in: Kühnlein, De vi et usu precandi et iurandi formularum apud decem oratores Atticos, progr. v. Neustadt a. d. H. (1882); Meinhardt, De forma et usu iuramentorum, quae inventiuntur in comic. Gr. et Platonis, Xenophontis, Luciani sermone, diss. Jena (1892); Ziebarth, De iure iurando in iure Graeco quaestiones, diss. Göttingen (1892).

²The epistolary oaths ascribed to the ten orators are incorporated in Kühnlein's collection, and those to Plato and Lucian in Meinhardt's.

ἀνθρώποις ἵστορες: Themist. 8. ὁ γῆ καὶ θεοί: Aristaen. 2. 20. θεοὶ ἐπιμάρτυρες ἔστων: Procop. 93. δμνυμι τοὺς θεούς: Pythag. 9. δμνυμι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν ἐπί σοι με ἀνάψαντα πόθον: Jul. 59. 3. ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ θεοί (2): Jul. 4. 37. 2. ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ θεοὶ πάντες (2): Jul. 58. 10, 62. 7. ἵστω Ζεύς, ἵστω μέγας Ἡλιος, ἵστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4. δμνυμι τίνα θεῶν;: Aristaen. 2. 2. κατόμνυσθε τοὺς θεούς: Aristaen. 2. 20.

OATH BY THE TWELVE GODS.

μὰ τοὺς δώδεκα θεούς: Alciph. 2. 3. 8 (Menander).

OATHS BY ATHENA (3).

νὴ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν (2): Alciph. 2. 3. 6 (Menander); Solon 4. ἵστω Ζεύς, ἵστω μέγας Ἡλιος, ἵστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4

OATHS BY APOLLO (3).¹

νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα: Aristaen. I. 4. Ἀπολλον ἀποτρόπαιε: Aristaen. 2. I. μὰ τὸν Ἀρισταῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα αὐτόν: Aelian 5.

OATH BY ARISTAEUS.

μὰ τὸν Ἀρισταῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα αὐτόν: Aelian 5.

OATHS BY ARTEMIS (9).

μὰ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν (4): Alciph. 2. I. 5, 2. 2. 6, 2. 4. 20; Aristaen. I. 10. νὴ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν (5): Alciph. 2. I. 8, 2. 4. 5, fr. 5. 4; Aristaen. I. 6, I. II.

OATHS BY APHRODITE (17).

μὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην: Alciph. 2. 2. 2. νὴ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην (6): Alciph. I. 39. 4, 2. I. 1, 2. I. 3, fr. 4. 1, fr. 5. 2; Aristaen. I. 8. πρὸς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης (3): Alciph. 2. 2. 6; Aristaen. I. 24, I. 27. πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης: Jul. 58. 3. δέσπουσα Ἀφροδίτη (3): Alciph. I. 32. I, I. 36. 3, I. 39. I. μαρτύρομαι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην: Aristaen. I. 25. οὐτως Ἰλεως εἴη μοι Ἀφροδίτη: Aristaen. 2. I. 3. νὴ τὴν μεγάλην θεόν: Alciph. I. 39. 2.

OATH BY GĒ.

ὁ γῆ καὶ θεοί: Aristaen. 2. 20.

¹ In his review of Professor Wright's Studies in Menander, Boll. di fil. cl., XVIII (1912) 195, Terzaghi says that slaves swore by Apollo. There is a special propriety in this as Apollo himself was a slave to Admetus (A. J. P. XXXII 364).—B. L. G.

OATH BY DEMETER.

μὰ τὴν καλλιγένειαν: Alciph. 2. 4. I.

OATHS BY THE TWO GODDESSES (5).

μὰ τὰς θεάς: Alciph. 2. 4. 3. *μὰ τὰς Ἐλευσινίας θεάς, μὰ τὰ μυστήρια αὐτῶν*: Alciph. 2. 3. I (Menander). *νὴ τῷ θεῷ* (2): Aristaen. I. 19, I. 27. *νὴ τὰ μυστήρια*: Alciph. 2. 2. 8.

OATHS BY JUSTICE (2).

νὴ τὴν Δίκην: Aristaen. I. 20. *νὴ τὴν θείαν δίκην*: Jul. 54. 3.

OATHS BY DIONYSUS (2).

μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τὸν βακχικὸν αὐτοῦ κισσούς: Alciph. 2. 3. IO (Menander). *ὦ φίλε Διόνυσε*: Aristaen. I. 18.

OATH BY DIONE.

νὴ τὴν Διώνην: Aristaen. I. 19.

OATHS BY EROS (10).

μὰ τὸν Ἔρωτας: Aristaen. 2. 16. *νὴ τὸν Ἔρωτα τὸν εὐτυχῶς εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν τετοξεύκοτα ψυχήν*: Aristaen. 2. 21. *νὴ τὸν Ἔρωτας* (4): Aristaen. I. 7, I. 22, I. 27, 2. 13. *πρὸς τὸν Ἔρωτος*: Aristaen. 2. 5. *πρὸς Ἔρωτος*: Philostrat. I3. *πρὸς Ἔρωτος αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλίας ἐκείνης*: Procop. 53. *ὦ φίλοι Ἔρωτες*: Procop. 15.

OATHS BY HERMES (2).

πρὸς Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν: Jul. 2. I. *Ἐρμῆ κερδῆε καὶ δλεξίκακε Ἡράκλεις*: Alciph. 3. 47. I.

OATH BY HESTIA.

νὴ τὴν ιερᾶν Ἑστίαν: Synes. 148. 284 c.

OATHS BY ZEUS (81).

μὰ Δία (19): Aesch. 12. I; Alciph. fr. 6. 17; Aristaen. I. 10, 2. 21; Brutus 56; Chio 3. 4; Diog. 29. I (twice); Hippoc. 20. 3; Jul. 22. I, 50. 3, 6I. 3; Phalar. 14I. 2, 145; Procop. 48, 74, 146; Themist. 4. I, 8. *μὰ τὸν Δία* (3): Aesch. 12. 9; Phalar. 136. I, 144. 4. *μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν ἄλλους θεούς*: Aesch. II. 6. *ναὶ μὰ Δία* (2): Aristaen. 2. 12; Jul. 3. I. *νὴ Δία* (15): Aelian 18; Alciph. I. 39. 5, I. 39. 7, fr. 6. 7; Brutus 40; Chio 16. 3; Demos. 4. 8; Hippoc. 17. 17; Jul. 59. 4; Luc. 3. 32; Phalar.

22, 141. 2, 143. 1; Socrat. 7. 2; Synes. 136. 272 b. *νὴ τὸν Δία*: Aristaen. I. 13. *νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν μέγιστον* (2): Phalar. 77. 2, 113. *νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν Ὄλυμπιον*: Socrat. 27. I. *πρὸς Διός* (9): Aesch. 2. 5; Alciph. 3. 5. 1; Aristaen. I. 13, 2. 9, 2. 19; Phalar. 140. 2, 158; Procop. 58, 125. *πρὸς τοῦ Διός*: Jul. 58. 14. ὁ Ζεῦ (5): Jul. 52. 1; Procop. 9, 116, 161, 163. ὁ Ζεῦ βασιλεὺς: Hippoc. 17. 16. *μὰ τὸν θεόν*: Jul. 16. 6. *μὰ τὸν Φίλιον τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σόν* (2): Aristaen. 2. 14. Synes. 103. 241 c. *ναὶ μὰ τὸν Φίλιον κτλ.* (2): Synes. 49. 187 d, 59. 203 d. *νὴ τὸν Φίλιον κτλ.*: Synes. 129. 263 c. *πρὸς φιλίου Διός*: Aen. I. *πρὸς Διὸς φιλίου*: Jul. 3. 2. *πρὸς Διὸς φιλίου τε καὶ ἑταφέον, καὶ τοῦ ἕτε κατὰ γῆν ἐν εὐσεβῶν χώρῳ ὄντος ἕτε κατ' ἄστρα Σωκράτους*: Socrat. 27. I. *πρὸς Φιλίου* (4): Procop. 75, 103, 116, 132. *πρὸς ἑταφέον Διὸς καὶ κοινῆς ἑστίας*: Phalar. 79. *πρὸς Διός τε ἵκεσίου καὶ θεῶν ὅμογνιών*: Hippoc. 26. *πρὸς Διὸς ξενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν*: Demos. 5. I. *ἴστω Ζεύς*: Jul. 22. 2. *ἴστω Ζεύς, ίστω μέγας Ἡλιος, ίστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι*: Jul. 37. 4. *ἴττω Ζεύς*: Plato. 7. 345. *μάρτυς δὲ Ἡλιος . . . καὶ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ζεύς*: Jul. 12. I. *ὅμνυμι τὸν πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐμοὶ αἴτιον καὶ σωτῆρα*: Jul. 71. 2.

OATHS BY HELIOS (3).

νὴ τὸν Ἡλον: Phalar. 142. 3. *ἴστω Ζεύς, ίστω μέγας Ἡλος, ίστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι*: Jul. 37. 4. *μάρτυς δὲ Ἡλιος . . . καὶ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ζεύς*: Jul. 12. I.

OATH BY HERA.

νὴ τὴν Ἡραν: Aristaen. I. 19.

OATHS BY HERACLES (7).

μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα: Phalar. 64. *νὴ τὸν Ἡρακλέα*: Crates 8. *Ἡράκλεις* (4): Alciph. 3. 61. 1; Hippoc. 17. 20; Luc. 3. 32; Procop. 54. *Ἐρμῆ κερδῷε καὶ ἀλεξίκακε Ἡράκλεις*: Alciph. 3. 47. I.

OATH BY THEMIS.

νὴ τὴν Θέμιν: Proclus, Typi Epistolares 40.

OATHS BY THE FATES.

ὁ φίλοι Μοῖραι: Alciph. I. 38. 5.

OATHS BY THE MUSES (4).

μὰ τὰς φίλας Μούσας: Alciph. 2. I. 7. *νὴ τὰς Μούσας* (2): Aristaen. 2. 5, 2. 19. *πρὸς Ἐρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν*: Jul. 2. I.

OATH BY NEMESIS.

Νέμεσι δέσποινα: Alciph. fr. 4. 3.

OATHS BY THE NYMPHS (2).

πρὸς τῶν Νυμφῶν καὶ τοῦ Πανὸς τούτου: Alciph. fr. 6. 6. *νὴ τὰς κωλιάδας Νύμφας:* Aristaen. I. 3.

OATHS BY PAN (2).

πρὸς τοῦ Πανὸς: Aelian I. *πρὸς τῶν Νυμφῶν καὶ τοῦ Πανὸς τούτου:* Alciph. fr. 6. 6.

OATH BY POSEIDON.

πρὸς τοῦ σοῦ Ποσειδῶνος: Aristaen. I. 7.

OATHS BY SERAPIS (2).

δύνυμ τὸν μέγαν Σάραπιν: Jul. 5. 2. *πρὸς τοῦ Σαράπιδος:* Jul. 9. 3.

OATHS BY THE GRACES (6).

νὴ τὰς Χάριτας (4): Aristaen. I. 3. I. 14, I. 19; Procop. 135. *πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων:* Aristaen. I. II. *πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης:* Jul. 58. 3.

OATH BY THE SEASONS.

νὴ τὰς φίλας Ὡρᾶς: Aristaen. I. II.

OATHS BY THE DEMONS (2).

πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων: Alciph. 3. 39. I. ὁ θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἴστορες: Themist. 8.

OATHS BY GOD (8).

ταῦτα θεόν, ταῦτα ἀνθρώπους μαρτύρομαι: Synes. 105. 249 d. *μαρτύρομαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν:* Synes. 57. 194 d. *μάρτυς θεός (2):* Synes. 146. 282 d, 146. 283 a. *νὴ τὸν ἔφορον ἀληθείας θεόν:* Synes. 105. 250 c. *δύνυμ θεὸν ὃν φιλοσοφία πρεσβεύει:* Synes. 4. 162 c. *μάρτυρα ποιοῦμαι θεὸν ὃν φιλοσοφία πρεσβεύει:* Synes. 123. 259 d. *μάρτυρα ποιοῦμαι θεὸν ὃν καὶ φιλοσοφία καὶ φιλία πρεσβεύει:* Synes. 96. 236 a.

OATHS BY HUMAN ATTRIBUTES (32).

ταῦτα θεόν, ταῦτα ἀνθρώπους μαρτύρομαι: Synes. 105. 249 d. *νὴ τὴν τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγήν:* Alciph. 2. 2. 8. *πρὸς τούτων τῶν γενείων:* Philostrat. 13. *νὴ τὴν τιμίαν σου διάθεσιν:* Synes. 129.

263 d. ὥμοσα κατ' ἔξωλείας ἐμαυτοῦ: Alciph. 3. 3. 4. πρὸς ἑταιρείου Διὸς καὶ κοινῆς ἑστίας: Phalar. 79. πρὸς τῆς σῆς εὐμονούσας: Aristaen. I. 2. πρὸς τοῦ σοῦ κάλλους: Aristaen. I. 4. νὴ τὴν ιεράν σου κεφαλήν (2): Synes. 95. 233 c. 105. 250 c. νὴ τὴν ιεράν σου κεφαλήν καὶ τὴν τῶν παιδίων μου σωτηρίαν: Synes. 95. 234 c. νὴ τὴν ιεράν σου καὶ τριπόθητον κεφαλήν: Synes. 79. 224 c. νὴ τὴν ιεράν ὑμῶν κεφαλήν: Synes. 79. 226 d. μὰ τὴν τιμίαν σου κεφαλήν: Synes. 134. 271 b. ναὶ μὰ τὴν φίλην σου καὶ σεβασμίαν κεφαλήν: Synes. 67. 214 d. πρὸς τῶν λόγων: Synes. 73. 220 d. ναὶ μὰ τοὺς λόγους: Synes. 91. 231 c. ὅμνυμι οὐ τὴν πλάτανον τὴν Σωκράτους ἀλλὰ τοὺς λόγους αὐτούς: Procop. 63. πρὸς τὸν Θαλδὸς μαστῶν καὶ φιλημάτων: Aristaen. 2. 16. μὰ τὸν σὸν Νεῖλον καὶ τὰς παρούσας σοὶ Χάριτας: Procop. 116. μὰ τὸν δόμογνιον τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σὸν: Synes. 95. 233 c. ναὶ μὰ τοὺς ἀψευδεῖς Παρρασίου πίνακας: Theophyl. 6. νὴ τὸ σὸν πρόσωπον: Aristaen. 2. 9. ὅμνυμι τὰς Χάριτας Πινθάδος: Aristaen. I. 12. πρὸς Διὸς φιλίου τε καὶ ἑταιρείου, καὶ τοῦ εἴτε κατὰ γῆν ἐν εὐσεβῶν χώρῳ ὄντος εἴτε κατ' ἀστρα.... Σωκράτους: Socrat. 27. I. μὰ τὴν σὴν φαρέτραν: Aristaen. 2. 13. πρὸς Ερωτος αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλίας ἐκείνης: Procop. 53. πρὸς σαντοῦ καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς φιλίας ἡμῶν: Diony. Antioch. 16. μὰ ἡμὰν φρένα καιομέναν πόθῳ: Jul. 59. I. ὅμνυώ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ σοὶ με ἀνάψαντα πόθον: Jul. 59. 3. ναὶ πρὸς ἐμῆς καὶ τῶν αὐταδέλφων τῶν ἐμῶν σωτηρίας: Alciph. 3. 39. 3. πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς: Synes. 141. 278 a.

Apart from the oaths "by human attributes", the Christian oaths of Synesius "by God", and the Egyptian oath "by Serapis", the preceding list of 33 different types of oaths includes all the oaths used in Greek comedy, except those by Asclepius and Hephaestus (which are not found in Aristophanes, either), together with the following additional oaths, suggestive of post-classic and Alexandrian influence: By Aristaeus, Justice, Dione, Eros, Hera (an oath used especially by Socrates), Themis, Fates, Muses, Nemesis, Nymphs, Pan, Graces, and Seasons.

The 293 oaths are distributed among 25 of the 60 authors in Hercher's volume as follows:

Aelian (4): Apollo (1), Aristaeus (1), Zeus (1), Pan (1) 4 types.

Aeneas (2): Gods collectively (1), Zeus (1) . . . 2 types.

Aeschines (9): Gods collectively (5), Zeus (4) . . . 6 types.

Alciphron (48) : Gods collectively (7), Twelve Gods (1), Athena (1), Artemis (6), Aphrodite (11), Demeter (1), Two Goddesses (3), Dionysus (1), Hermes (1), Zeus (5), Heracles (2), Fates (1), Muses (1), Nemesis (1), Nymphs (1), Pan (1), Demons (1), Human attributes (3) 33 types.

Aristaenetus (60) : Gods collectively (13), Apollo (2), Artemis (3), Aphrodite (5), Gê (1), Two Goddesses (2), Justice (1), Dionysus (1), Dione (1), Eros (7), Zeus (8), Hera (1), Muses (2), Nymphs (1), Poseidon (1), Graces (4), Seasons (1), Human attributes (6) 41 types.

Brutus (2) : Zeus (2) 2 types.

Chio (2) : Zeus (2) 2 types.

Crates (1) : Heracles (1) 1 type.

Demosthenes (4) : Gods collectively (2), Zeus (2) 3 types.

Diogenes (3) : Gods collectively (1); Zeus (2) 2 types.

Dionysius of Antioch (1) : Human attributes (1) 1 type.

Hippocrates (8) : Gods collectively (3), Zeus (4), Heracles (1) 7 types.

Julian (43) : Gods collectively (18), Athena (1), Aphrodite (1), Justice (1), Hermes (1), Zeus (13), Helios (2), Muses (1), Serapis (2), Graces (1), Human attributes (2) 25 types.

Lucian (2) : Zeus (1), Heracles (1) 2 types.

Phalaris (29) : Gods collectively (14), Zeus (12), Helios (1), Heracles (1), Human attributes (1) 12 types.

Philostratus (3) : Gods collectively (1), Eros (1), Human attributes (1) 3 types.

Plato (2) : Gods collectively (1), Zeus (1) 2 types.

Procopius (26) : Gods collectively (6), Eros (2), Zeus (13), Heracles (1), Graces (1), Human attributes (3) 15 types.

Pythagoreans (1) : Gods collectively (1) 1 type.

Socratics (4) : Zeus (3), Human attributes (1) 3 types.

Solon (1) : Athena (1) 1 type.

Synesius (28) : Gods collectively (1), Hestia (1), Zeus (5), God (8), Human attributes (13) 18 types.

Themistocles (4) : Gods collectively (1), Zeus (2), Demons (1) 2 types.

Theophylactus (5): Gods collectively (4). Human attributes (1) 2 types.

Proclus, *Typi Epistolares* (1): *Themis* (1) . . . 1 type.

Note especially that three authors, Aristaenetus, Alciphron, and Julian, contain 151 of the total of 293 oaths; and that three others, Phalaris, Synesius, and Procopius, contain 83 more, leaving the remaining 59 oaths to be divided among the other nineteen authors. The first group is further distinguished by the great variety of oaths; while with Synesius, the Christian writer, one is struck with the presence of non-Christian oaths.

The formulae largely conform to what we know to have been normal. *vñ θeoύs*, Aristaen. I. 4, seems unique, elsewhere in Greek literature always *vñ τoύs θeoύs*.¹ The epistolographers prefer *πρός θeώv* (15) to *πρός τoύs θeώv* (2), as do Plato and Menander and the Middle Comedy, in striking contrast with Aristophanes a further confirmation of the assumed popular decreasing use of the article.² In the oaths by Zeus, with *μά*, *vñ*, *πρός* and without a modifying epithet, the shorter forms predominate 45 to five. This also is in keeping with the usage of Plato, Lucian,³ the Middle Comedy,⁴ and Menander.⁵ There are three violations of the general rule, proved for Aristophanes, Menander, and the orators, that oaths introduced by *πρός* are confined to imperative and interrogative sentences⁶: Aristaen. I. 24 (corrupt), I. 27; Jul. 59. 14.

There are many oaths cast in unusual, literary, non-idiomatic forms, but not more than might be expected in such artificial writers. The artificiality of some of these oaths is evidently recognized by the user. Thus, Procop. 93, *νυὶ δὲ μιμήσομαι γοῦν τι ποητικὸν καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι, θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυρες ἔστων*; or Plato 7. 345, *ἴττῳ Ζεύς φησιν ὁ Θηβαῖος*. Artificiality is a notable characteristic of most of the oaths under the heading, "Oaths by human attributes". This is

¹ Cf. *Studies in Menander*, 36, 71.

² Ibid., 9.

³Cf. Meinhardt, 18 f.

⁴Cf. Selvers, *De mediae comoediae sermone*, diss. Westphalia (1909), 61.

¹Cf. Studies in Menander, 35. This applies to μά, νή. πρὸς (*τοῦ*) Διός does not occur in the extant Menander.

[•] Ibid., 9.

balanced in most cases by peculiar appropriateness to the situation under which they are uttered or to the person to whom they are addressed. Such appropriateness appears elsewhere also, for, Alciph. 2. 4. 1, Glycera swears to Menander by Calligenia in whose temple she is. In Alciph. fr. 6. 6, one of the merry women swears by the Nymphs and the Graces whose statues stand near by. "By thy Poseidon", is the oath addressed, Aristaen. I. 7, to a fisherman, and, id. 2. 21, the love-sick Abrocomas swears by Cupid who has shot so straight into his heart.

The established principles of sex appropriateness, also, are well observed: Women do not swear by Athena,¹ Apollo,² or Heracles.³ Men do not swear by Artemis.⁴ The oath by Poseidon⁵ is used by the maiden in the passage just mentioned, for the fisherman's sake. Aristaen. I. 18, a woman invokes Dionysus,⁶ but she is one who knows and praises the charms of wine. Alciph. 2. 31 ascribes to Menander the oath by the two Goddesses,⁷ but it is to be noticed that it is not in the usual feminine form, and that it is addressed to a woman and is coupled with the oath by the mysteries, which were especially sacred in the eyes of every Athenian. Such exceptions rather attest than disprove the rules.

What bearing may this study have upon the vexed problem of the authenticity of the letters in Hercher's volume? As is well-known, a very considerable proportion of them were written, not by the philosophers, orators, or statesmen to whom they are ascribed, but by sophistic falsifiers of the Imperial Roman or Byzantine period. The ascription in whole or in part has been doubted by one or more scholars in the case of fourteen of the 25 "authors" of our list. These fourteen are⁸ Aeschines, Brutus, Chio, Crates, Demosthenes, Diogenes, Hippocrates, Julian, Phalaris, Philostratus, Plato, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Solon. From the investigations of Kühnlein and Meinhardt, we know the oaths used in the undisputed works of Aeschines, Demosthenes, and Plato, three of the fourteen. Do the same oaths occur in the letters ascribed to them? Those used in the "letters of Aeschines", μὰ τὸν

¹ Ibid., 15.

² Ibid., 18.

³ Ibid., 45.

⁴ Meinhardt, 57.

⁵ Studies in Menander, 48.

⁶ Ibid., 29 f.

⁷ Ibid., 28.

⁸ Cf. Christ, Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur⁸, s. v.

θεούς (3), ἢ θεοί (1), πρὸς Διός (1), μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν ἄλλους θεούς (1), μὰ τὸν Δία (1), and μὰ Δία (1), are all common types of oaths and might well have been used in his orations. But it so happens that while the orator uses oaths that are similar in form, μὰ Δία, occurring twice, is the only one of these that he actually does use. Of those in the letters ascribed to Demosthenes, μὰ τὸν θεούς (1) occurs twenty times in the orations, and νὴ Δία (1), 99 times; but πρὸς Διὸς ξενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν (1) is to be found neither in the undisputed Demosthenes nor apparently elsewhere in classical Greek literature. The two oaths in the "Platonic" letters both occur in his surely authentic works: νὴ τὸν θεούς (1), eleven times, and ἦττα Ζεύς (1) in Phaedo 62 a, where, as in the letter, it is recognized as a peculiarly Theban oath: Cebes, the Theban, τὴν αὐτοῦ φωνὴν εἴπων. This might be conscious imitation, or mere coincidence. It certainly furnishes no conclusive evidence. Apparently oaths were not one of the characteristics of the style of their models which the epistolographers made any general effort to imitate. At least it is hazardous to use them as a test of the authenticity of the letters.

F. WARREN WRIGHT.

SMITH COLLEGE.

V.—CHAUCER'S GRISELDA AND HOMER'S ARETE.

Griselda's virtues and charms, manifest to all the world after her marriage to Walter, are extolled by Chaucer at some length. She seemed born of noble lineage (Clerk's Tale 393–9), rather than of Janicula (400–6); every one loved her (407–413); not only in Saluzzo, but throughout the country, did her fame extend (414–420), so that the people admired Walter's prudence in making such a choice (421–7).

So far Chaucer follows Petrarch, who in turn follows Boccaccio, the latter adding that Walter considered himself the happiest man alive. But then Chaucer goes on to a new article of praise (428–441) :

Nat only this Grisildis thurgh hir wit
Coude al the feet of wyfly hoomlinesse,
But eek, whan that the cas requyred it,
The commune profit coude she redresse.
Ther nas discord, rancour, ne hevinesse
In al that lond, that she ne coude apese,
And wysly bringe hem alle in reste and ese.

Though that hir housbonde absent were anoon,
If gentil men, or othere of hir contree,
Were wrothe, she wolde bringen hem atoon;
So wyse and rype wordes hadde she,
And jugements of so greet equitee,
That she from heven sent was, as men wende,
Peple to save, and every wrong tamende.

Here, again, Chaucer is following Petrarch, whose account¹ may be thus rendered :

Nor was she skilful merely in the occupations of a housewife, but, whenever occasion demanded, she acted in a public capacity in the absence of her husband, putting an end to civil strife, and allaying the dissensions of the nobility; her well-considered

¹ *Neque vero sollers sponsa muliebria tantum ac (Opera, 1581, *hæc*) domestica, sed, ubi res posceret, publica etiam obibat officia viro absente* (ed. 1472: *viro etiam abeunte*; ed. Veesenmeyer, Fiske Library of Cornell University: *publica officia etiam obibat viro abeunte*), *lites*

utterances being conceived with such ripeness and fairness of judgment that every one declared her to have been sent down from heaven for the salvation of the commonwealth.

This passage is manifestly important for the characterization of Griselda, since it shows that she was neither a timid serf, cowering in the presence of a superior order, nor a fanatic incapable of sober sense, nor yet a creature whose will had been enfeebled by overmuch meditation upon an ideal of saintly passivity. Rather does it impart to her a solidity and relief without which she might seem relatively bloodless and attenuated. By this touch she takes on a certain likeness to Antigone and Penelope, women of principle and decision—not masculine, but fit consorts for men of power and rank, suited to be mothers of a noble breed.

The Hellenic ideal of womanly competence and equality to every occasion is well illustrated by Arete, queen of the Phæcians. Though she is swiftly and silently obedient to her husband's requests (8. 423-444), it is by her wisdom that he is ruled. Nausicaa tells Odysseus that, when he has found the palace of Alcinous, he is to enter and find Arete at her spinning, and Alcinous at his wine. Then (Od. 6. 310-5, tr. Cotterill) :

Him pass hastily by, but my mother approach, and entreat her,
Clasping her knees with thy hands; and the joyous day of returning
Soon shalt thou see—yea, though far distant lieth thy country.
Shouldst thou be able to gain of my mother her heart and her favor,
Then good hope will be thine to revisit thy friends, and in safety
Win to thy well-built home once more, and the land of thy fathers.

Almost identical is the counsel of Pallas Athene, in the form of a Phæcian maiden (Od. 7. 75-7) :

Shouldst thou be able to gain of the lady her heart and her favor,
Then good hope will be thine to revisit thy friends, and in safety
Win to thy high-roofed home once more, and the land of thy fathers.

Odysseus obeys, and to Arete he thus appeals (Od. 7. 151-2) :

Nay, but vouchsafe me an escort, and aid my return to my homeland
Soon, for afar from my friends long years have I suffered affliction.

patriæ nobiliumque discordias dirimens atque componens tam gravibus
responsis tantaque maturitate et judicii æquitate ut omnes ad salutem
publicam demissam cœlo feminam prædicarent.

Arete makes no immediate answer, but later addresses him (Od. 7. 233-9) :

White-armed Arete then began, and breaking the silence
 Spake, for she wondering saw and remembered the mantle and doublet,
 Beautiful garments wherat she had worked, both she and her maidens.
 Opening therefore her lips, these swift-winged words she addressed him :
 'First, O stranger, I ask—yea, even myself will demand it—
 Who art thou? Whence art thou come? Who gave thee the raiment
 thou wearest?

Didst thou not say that thou camest a wanderer over the ocean?'

To which Odysseus then replies at some length (Od. 7. 241-297).

The next day, after Odysseus had paused in his tale, Arete addresses her subjects, and proposes that they shall bestow gifts upon the stranger (Od. 11. 336-341), her suggestion being cordially seconded by Alcinous.

It is Athene who, speaking of Alcinous and Arete, describes her in this memorable passage (Od. 7. 67-74), of which the italicized part bears a likeness, it will be seen, to certain sentences quoted above from Chaucer and Petrarch :

Her hath he honored as surely on earth no other is honored,
 None of the wives who in these our days keep house for their husbands.
 Heartily thus was she ever respected, and still is respected,
 Both by the Ruler himself and by all of her children belovèd,
 Ay, and the people; for *all as a goddess regard her*, and greet her
 Ever with reverent words when she walketh abroad in the city.
Yea, and truly she lacks not at all of a good understanding:
Those she befriends, nay, even the men, their quarrels she endeth.

There is not only a likeness here, but it seems practically certain that Petrarch borrowed the trait from Homer, as Chaucer, in turn, borrowed it from Petrarch. Petrarch had been interested in Homer for several years. A Latin translation had been made for him, and the first instalment of the Odyssey reached him about the end of 1365, the rest following in 1367.¹ Portions of the Odyssey only a few lines later (Od. 7. 88 ff., 100-101) than those last quoted are referred to in Petrarch's

¹ Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, 2d ed., 2. 164-5. Petrarch's copy of the Iliad was being illuminated while he was in Pavia on the occasion of the wedding of Lionel and Violante (see my monograph, *The Last Months of Chaucer's Earliest Patron*, pp. 74 ff.); cf. Nolhac 2. 166; 1. 118.

treatise, *De Avaritia Vitanda*,¹ and the account of the Phæacian feast (Od. 7. 136 ff.) is touched upon in his poem of *Africa* (3. 375-6) :

Talis apud mensas (nisi testem spernis Homerum)
Cena fit Alcinoi; sedet illic blandus Ulysses.

Having finished a marginal commentary upon the *Iliad*, death overtook him while he was still engaged upon a similar comment on the *Odyssey*, the point actually reached being Od. 2.242.

Here, then, the spirit of mediævalism, in one of its most consummate creations, borrows a stroke from the earliest Grecian antiquity, and heightens the portrait of Janicula's daughter, a 'povre creature', sprung from a peasant 'which that was holden povrest of hem all', by a trait belonging to Arete, queen of the lordly Phæacians, and great-grand-daughter of Poseidon, the Earth-shaker.

Chaucer is usually credited with only three allusions to Homer (Il. 3. 277; 12. 17; 24. 527), all derived from Boethius (Skeat, Oxford Chaucer 6. xcvi).

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

¹Cf. Körting, *Petrarca's Leben und Werke*, p. 476; Petrarch, *Opera*, 1581, p. 550 (= Sen. 6. 8 *Frac.*). Other references to the *Odyssey* will be found in Sen. 1. 5; 4. 5; 8. 3; 9. 1; 12. 2 (1); 15. 3 (14.4), according to Nolhac (2. 169, note 2; cf. 1. 204. For the subject in general, see Nolhac 2. 161 ff.

VI.—NEW COLLATION OF PARISINUS 7900 A FOR THE EPISTLES OF HORACE.

Certain variations from Keller and Holder's collation of Parisinus 7900 A, as given in their critical edition of the Odes and Epodes of Horace (1899), were printed in A. J. P., Vol. XXIII, No. 1. For the sake of completeness the following variations for the Epistles are now printed. It is unlikely that a second edition of the Epistles will be forthcoming soon. The ms. does not contain the Satires and gives only part of the first book of the Epistles.

EPISTLES I.

- 1, 42, *videns* A, *vides* A *corr.* 13, *Inscriptio*. Not to be assigned to A. In modern hand.
79, *vivaria* A.
95, *occurit* A.
2, 1, *scriptorem* A.
5, *deſtinet* A, *detinet* A *corr.*
7, *conlisa* A₁, *collisa* A₂.
12, *Pelliden* A, *Peliden* A *corr.*
49, *poſſessor* A, *possessor* A *corr.*
51, *et] ut* A.
53, *dolentes* A.
65, *ira* A.
65, *equę* A, *equę* A *corr.*
3, 4. Not to be identified with A₁. The entire line is supplied by a modern hand. A strip of vellum has been cut out.
31, *minatius* A.
5, 5, *menturnas* A.
12, *fortuna* A.
18, *addocet* A. (Hole in ms.)
6, 5, *terrae* A.
12, *mūtuatne* A.
26, *et omis* A, *et* A₂.
29, *fugum* A.
14, 37, *quomodo* A.
40, *mavis* A *corr.*
15, 4, *perluor* A.
15, *pærrennes* A, *perrennes* A *corr.*
17, *perfer* A, *perferre* A *corr.*
17, *patique* A, *patique* A *corr.*
26. No evidence that a new letter begins here.
38-45 A gives verses in following order, using K. and H.'s numbering: 38, 43, 44, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45. A₂ gives order as in K. and H.'s edition (1864).
16, *Inscriptio*. *Ad quintinm A.*
13, *thraecam* A, *thracam* A *corr.*
13, *neo* A.
34, *detrahit* A₁, *detrahet* A₂.
40, *mendicā* A₁, *mendacem* A₂.
51, *opetum* A₁, *opertum* A₂.

- 52, bonis A.
 56, damnū A.
 65, qui A.
 17, 10, quis A.
 15, fastidiret A.
 33, hostis A, hostes A₂.
 44, sumasne A.
 18, 5, propeius A₁, propemaius
 A₂.
 7, tonsa cute A.
 12, voce set A, voces set =
 voces et A₂.
 14, partis A₁, partes A₂.
 35, officios A₁, officium A₂.
 36, agit A₁, aget A₂.
 46, Aetoliis A₁, Aetolis A₂.
 53, quiractet A₁, quitractet A₂.
 62, fertur A₁, refertur A₂.
 67, egestu A.
 69, garulus A₁, garrulus A₂.
 81, tuerisque A₁, tuterisque A₂.
- 82, ecquid A.
 87, metuit A₁, metuet A₂.
 90, manuumq. A₁, navumq. A₂.
 100, doctrinā A.
 108, dii A₁, di A₂.
 19, 5 dulces soluerunt A₁, dulces
 soluerunt = dulces solu-
 erunt A₂.
 15, Timagenis A.
 18, liberent A₁, biberent A₂.
 19, imitores A.
 20, vilem A₁, bilem A₂.
 20, iocum A.
 30, quaerit A.
 35, scine A₁, scire A₂.
 35, ignatus A₁, ignatūs A₂.
 41, illae A.
 49, fune A₁, funebre A₂.
 20, 13, ILERDUM A₁, on margin
 to right.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

T. Lucretius Carus. *Of the Nature of Things*, a metrical translation, by WILLIAM ELLERY LEONARD. London, Paris and Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, Limited; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. [1916]. Pp. XV+301. Frontispiece. 4s. 6d.

So far as I can now recall, this is the first translation, or at all events the first important translation of the entire poem of Lucretius into English verse which has appeared since Creech's time, two centuries ago. For this reason alone the new version might well deserve a more extensive treatment than can be given it in this brief notice.

The translation is preceded by a Preface (VII–XII) and by a sonnet 'To the Master'. A large proportion of the Preface is taken up with some more or less obvious remarks on the art of translation in general. To my own thinking the space devoted to this lucubration could have been occupied to much greater advantage by something else. For example, as a translator of Lucretius, Professor Leonard might have devoted at least a paragraph to his own predecessors; and as a professor of English, he is doubtless able to speak with authority regarding the influence of this great poet on our literature. To be sure there is one brief reference to Munro, but I confess feeling a certain vague resentment at the somewhat cryptic expression, 'meticulous impeccability', which is bestowed upon that great translation.

In the two Italian phrases quoted from Carlo Giussani, 'abbondanza Lucretiana' (p. IX) should be 'abbondanza Lucreziana' and 'evidentimenti' (p. 117 n.) should be 'evidentemente'. 'Carlo Guissani' appears in the first line of the Preface and this is the form in which the name of the great Lucretian scholar, Carlo Giussani, occurs throughout the entire book. 'Mens praecipit oculos', as Quintilian says, and as we ourselves learn to our sorrow when we undertake to correct our own proof.

The metrical form used by Professor Leonard is blank verse, and this, it seems to me, is a wise choice. Blank verse is adjustable to many moods, and one needs such a form if one is to translate a poet like Lucretius, who in descriptive bits can rise to the empyrean and yet in dogmatic passages can vindicate his

right to be called one of the clearest and most logical thinkers in the entire history of philosophical speculation.

In discussing Professor Leonard's version it may be interesting to note that in his opinion 'The translator of Lucretius (p. XI) is struck with the curious mixture of archaic and colloquial expressions, with the frequent rhymes, and with that insistent alliteration which the delicate art of the next generation was to subdue to a quiet allusiveness'. Students of Ennius and of the earlier literature will not be so deeply impressed by this statement. Moreover it is a well-known fact that the differences in style and form between Lucretius the poet and Lucretius the philosopher are too marked to be accidental. Professor Leonard's *aperçu*, however, has an interest of its own. It suggests that some of the more striking peculiarities of his style as a translator are deliberate attempts to reproduce what he conceives to be the tone of his original. Certainly whatever else it may be, his own style is a 'curious mixture of archaic and colloquial expressions'. Here we have (p. 220) 'the bodies of the strong-y-winged', there (p. 239) 'What erst was of a price, becomes at last a discard of no honour'; here (p. 93) 'Those scriven leaves of thine', there (p. 32) 'Bones to be sprung from littlest bones minute'. Sometimes the colloquialism is due to literal translation, as in V, 1-2,

Quis potis est dignum pollenti pectore carmen
condere pro rerum maiestate hisque repertis?

which he renders,

O who can build with puissant breast a song
Worthy the majesty of these great finds?

Of course, 'finds' is an absolutely literal translation of 'repertis'. But as not infrequently occurs in such oddly literal examples, 'finds' does not belong to the stylistic sphere of 'repertis' at all; like 'discard' in the phrase just quoted, it does not, in my own opinion, belong in the same sphere with Lucretius at any time. On the contrary it reminds one distantly of

crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinno

which was Labeo's rendition of Homer's (*Iliad*, 4, 35),

ώμὸν βεβράθοις Πρίαμον Πριάμοιό τε παιδας.

'Inland rivers, far and wide away' (p. 10) is only one of many lines that might be quoted illustrating the marked tendency of colloquial speech to group prepositions. I am inevitably reminded of a rustic tale once told me in which I was informed among other things that 'George went down around in back of the barn every time he took a smoke'. Indeed, the occurrence of such words as 'ilk', 'thunder-heads', etc., suggest local dialects as well as colloquial usage to the ordinary reader.

Professor Leonard has a tendency to make favourites of words like 'sturdy', and 'skiey', to affect such compendia as 'tmust', and such rarities as 'wrinklest'. On the whole his vocabulary is odd rather than striking, and unusual rather than poetical. He is very fond of the word 'percase', he tells of 'chariots . . . areek With hurly slaughter' (p. 115), his 'ploughman . . . crackles, prating, how the ancient race' (p. 89), 'Space . . . extends Unmetered forth in all directions round' (p. 48), 'caeli regionibus I, 64 appears as 'region skies' (p. 5), 'solis praeclaras luce' II, 1032 as 'the splendour-sun' (p. 83), 'alta turris ruere' V, 307 as 'the lofty towers ruin down' (p. 199). If it were not for the original 'repetunt oculis (which he reads with Creech instead of ollis) gestum pede convenienti' IV, 791, it would be difficult for the average man to know what in the world was meant by such a phrase as 'With speedy motion and with eyeing heads' (p. 165). What is an eyeing head? Indeed, it would sometimes seem, to paraphrase freely from Professor Leonard's own sonnet, 'To the Master', that his sturdy voice of still unconquered youth hath in an unknown tongue reported Lucretius. Certainly there is very little here of the strange solitary majesty of Lucretius, and only a distant echo now and then of those wonderful phrases which stirred the imagination of men like Vergil, Horace, and Ovid, which suggested to Spenser some of his finest lines and which occasionally shine in the great Dryden when he is at his best. Nevertheless, I gladly agree with Professor Leonard's critic in the Spectator that 'he has faced a very difficult task with much real success'.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, by HUBERTIS M. CUMMINGS. University of Cincinnati Studies X; Cincinnati, 1916.

The subject of Mr. Cummings's dissertation, which is published in the latest of the University of Cincinnati Studies, is one to arouse the very greatest interest and expectation. For next to the matter of French influence, the problem of Italian sources is perhaps the most important in the Chaucerian field. But considering the full nature of the questions involved, and realizing that we have a right to expect the most delicate and acute criticism if anyone takes upon himself the burden of such an investigation, one cannot feel that Mr. Cummings has satisfied our hopes in this volume.

Legitimately enough perhaps, the chief point of the book is to minimize the influence of Boccaccio on Chaucer. The author takes up the various works of the former by turns and states as completely as he is able the extent of their contributions to Chaucer's poems. In a laudable fashion he accepts none of the old conclusions in regard to borrowings but turns over all the old material for a reexamination of its soundness, leaving ultimately as established Chaucer's indebtedness to only the Filostrato and the Teseide. All this would be splendid and indeed worth while if we could feel that Mr. Cummings's judgment were trustworthy; but very soon we discover that we cannot.

His first chapter restudies the thesis proposed by Professor Young that Chaucer used the Filocolo in parts of Troilus and Criseyde. He repeats the parallels cited by Young—the seven for the love-scene, and in these he detracts slightly from their force individually but he does not upset the argument derived from them taken all together. The only parallel regarding which he seems to make his point is the first, where he gives striking evidence to show that the Filostrato might be considered as furnishing sufficient material in itself, and this would be a good preparation for the rest of his case if that only proved to be equally tenable. In discussing the fourth parallel, however, he misrepresents or misunderstands Young's argument. Cummings shows that the jealousy of Troilus on account of Horaste is not comparable to or related to the jealousy of Florio on account of Fileno. Young was really not concerned with such an equation at all, but with the use of the name Horaste by Pandarus and the assurance in response given by Criseyde as related to the assurances given by Bianceflore to Florio in the equivalent scene. Finally Cummings does not mention, much less deal with, the long list of almost verbal parallels between the Troilus and the Filocolo at the place where the Filostrato differs, which are in their way really more remarkable than even the quite remarkable episodic parallels. It cannot be said, then, that Cummings's work here upsets a conclusion which has for some time been almost universally accepted by Chaucerian scholars, or that it deals with the problem even fairly or adequately, and this is one of the most important contributions which the dissertation attempts to make.

The second of these contributions is found in the comparison of the Troilus with the Filostrato itself. He does give a proper answer to Legouis' totally mistaken criticism of the English poem; but he is himself certainly very far from the truth when he says in his study of Chaucer's characters as compared with Boccaccio's that "There are really no preponderant differences in the characterizations of the two groups". This matter has been treated sufficiently by scholars in the past, for instance by Kittredge in his chapter on the Troilus in Chaucer and his

Poetry—a work curiously not referred to at all in the study, while Dodd's book on Courtly Love is cited as the chief authority. He neglects to pay any attention to Chaucer's additions at the end of the *Troilus*, so far as pointing out their philosophical significance is concerned, and yet these additions change the whole character of the poem from a sentimental to a rational tragedy.

Omissions of a similar kind appear in his study of the adaptation of the *Teseide*. Suggestions long ago offered by Ten Brink in regard to the character of Arcite as Chaucer transformed it, might here have been discussed and perhaps developed. It may be useful to stop here and point out some of the changes in Arcite. In Boccaccio, this figure appears as a more or less mewling, peevish hero, who wails a good deal about his fate, who tries to avoid fighting, and who speaks a long lament on his own mishaps. In Chaucer's poem, Arcite is thoroughly manly; his manhood demands that he shall fight; and as to fate, although he sighs like an orthodox lover, he says:

Allas, why pleynen folk so in commune
Of purveyaunce of God or of Fortune,
That yeveth hem ful ofte in many a gyse
Wel bettre than they can hemself devyse? (ll. 1251 ff.)

Ten Brink expressed the contrast with the remark that, "Arcite . . . becomes much more positive and violent in his (Chaucer's) hands"; it seems to me that he also becomes more of a man. In general, in both poems—the *Troilus* as well as the *Knight's Tale*—Chaucer shows himself as the stronger, perhaps more virile, and also cleaner and fresher story-teller. Boccaccio, as we might expect, is softer and more voluptuous, sometimes sickly and tearful. No such contrast in tone is hinted by Cummings.

Further details in the study reveal no less weakness in grasping the issues involved. Little is done with the Lollius question. Cummings is inclined to hold to the old view that Chaucer did not know Boccaccio's name—an idea which seems inconceivable remembering Chaucer's trips to Italy and his extensive interest in the Italian poet. Even Lydgate knew who Boccaccio was. But enough of this; there is already plenty to show that this study of the Italian field will not get us very far in our desire to know of Chaucer's relations with Boccaccio. While much in the book shows that pains have been taken and that the author has wished to leave no stone unturned in regard to matters of Chaucer's borrowings, the study will not serve even as the latest—much less the last—word on the subject. In some places it does not seem to be properly brought up to date in documentation—references to articles on questions in point are often

omitted: such as, to Young's article on the possible influence of Sercambi, and Hinckley's preliminary suggestion, or to the numerous articles on the problem of Trophee.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PENNA.

An Introduction to the Study of Language, by LEONARD BLOOMFIELD, Assistant Professor of Comparative Philology and German in the University of Illinois. X + 335 pages. 12mo. \$1.75. Henry Holt and Company. 1914.

Leonard Bloomfield's book is intended to offer the general reader and the student who is entering upon linguistic work a summary of what is now known about language, such as Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language* and *The Life and Growth of Language* did a half-century ago. There is need of a book that sets up the goal which Bloomfield has set himself. We have no one book of the nature of Whitney's which embodies for us the results of the great progress of linguistic science in the last fifty years. Unlike most other writers on linguistics, but like Whitney, the author does not limit himself to the treatment of one language group, such as Indo-European, but takes up the various possible modes of human expression. There is probably no one other factor which is so conducive to the transforming of the ordinary uninteresting, meaningless details of phonology and morphology of a single language into living phenomena fraught with interest, as this comparative method of attack. In accordance with the general direction which progress in linguistic study has taken since Whitney, the author emphasizes the importance of phonetics and of the modern psychological interpretation of language. He treats in ten chapters the following topics: 1. nature and origin of language; 2. physical basis of language; 3. mental basis of language; 4. forms of language; 5. morphology; 6. syntax; 7. internal change in language; 8. external change of languages; 9. teaching of languages; 10. study of language.

It is perhaps partly due to the necessity of using the technical terminology of scientific psychology and of constantly linking psychological doctrine with linguistic phenomena that Bloomfield's style does not always have the simplicity and clearness of Whitney's. Also in another related respect he has emulated neither his great predecessor nor that other master of linguistic science, Hermann Paul. Both these scholars choose their

examples from their respective mother-tongues. Bloomfield does not avail himself, as he might, of this pedagogical advantage of proceeding from the known to the unknown. It is well known how intangible phonetics seems to the beginner and that here, if anywhere, the starting-place should be familiar sounds and articulations. It may reasonably be assumed that besides English a rather large percentage of the readers of this book will understand French, German, and Latin. Yet on p. 28 the bilabial spirant of Dutch and Spanish is discussed, that of South German is not mentioned; there follows a discussion of coronal articulation in Spanish, the modern languages of India, French, German, and finally English; on p. 29 the r- sound of Slavic, Italian, French, German is treated, then finally that of American English. Considerably more space is devoted to the Czech r than to the American. On p. 30 we find a description first of Slavic, then German and French, and finally of English l; on p. 32 the spirant pronunciation of g in modern Greek precedes that of German. Leaving the field of phonetics, we find (p. 132) examples chosen from Italian instead of from the more generally known Latin to illustrate how the ending of a word may show its gender. In exemplifying the use of the reflexive construction where we use the passive (p. 173), why place Russian before French? etc., etc.

As may be seen from these few examples, a more sparing use throughout the book of out-of-the-way illustrations would have been more conducive to clearness and would have added to the value of the book. It hardly seems necessary for the purposes of an "introduction" to discuss the dialectic differences in the use of numeratives in Chinese (p. 131), which have no essential bearing on the question at issue, or to discuss group-stress in French, Japanese, English, German, Russian, Czech, Icelandic, and Polish (p. 149), in short, to confuse the beginner by discussions of and illustrations from approximately *seventy* different languages and dialects.

The chapter on the Physical Basis of Language does not come up to the high standard of the rest of the book. A treatise on phonetics which lacks plates or diagrams of the vocal organs is, of course, handicapped to begin with. In his desire to give examples for every possible sound, an entirely unnecessary proceeding for the purposes of this book, the author often loses himself in a mass of intricate detail, as when he distinguishes between the manner of opening the glottis in some Armenian dialects and in Georgian, or tells that wide unrounded u "is said to be spoken also in Armenian and in Turkish", or recounts the occurrence of palatal stops in French dialects, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Spanish, Italian, and French. As above mentioned, the unknown regularly precedes the known.

The author's presentation of the positions of the glottis is at variance with the facts. "Both in whispering", says he, "and in ordinary speech the unvoiced sounds are pronounced with the glottis in its widest-open position, the muscles of the vocal chords being relaxed and the breath passing freely through the larynx: this, as we have seen, is also the position for regular breathing" (p. 26). As a matter of fact, with unvoiced sounds the vocal chords form an angle of about fifteen degrees, in ordinary breathing of about twenty-five degrees. The regular breathing position is not the "widest-open position". The latter, with a much greater angle than in normal breathing, is the position in violent breathing (after running, etc.) or in blowing.

The statement that the glottal stop "is used in German initially in the pronunciation of words that in writing begin with a vowel" (p. 24) is only partly true. The syllable beginning with a glottal stop must ordinarily be accented.

The author unnecessarily aggravates the difficulty encountered in trying to see the raising and lowering of the velum by directing the reader to breathe through both mouth and nose, and then pronounce 'ah'. It is much simpler to breathe through the nose alone and then to say 'ah'.

The discussion of the dentals is inexact. English and German d and t are coronal or dorsal, French d and t usually dorsal. The author gives all three as coronal (p. 28). It is doubtful whether n ever occurs as an entirely unvoiced sound in such words as *mint, snow*; certainly not "often" (p. 29).

Unsatisfactory, too, is the treatment of the blade sounds. For Bloomfield they are synonymous with what we call in Jespersen's terminology 'rill spirants', namely unvoiced s, voiced z, and the sibilants in *shall* and *azure*. But, as noted above, English, German, and French d and t are often or usually blade sounds. Why Bloomfield applies the name 'abnormal sibilants' to the sibilants in *shall* and *azure* I do not see.

The traditional division of sounds into 'consonants' and 'vowels' is given up (p. 33) in favor of the terms 'noise-articulations' and 'musical articulations'. I cannot see why the two conventional terms, which stand for something quite definite if they are understood, as they ordinarily are, as names for a manner of articulation, are "untenable for purposes of exact terminology", when the author admits that there is no definite boundary between the noise-articulations and the musical-articulations. Moreover, these latter terms belong properly to a treatment of phonetics emphasizing the acoustic side, while the author presents physiological phonetics.

The chapter on the Teaching of Languages seems out of place in this book. The author himself seems to have felt this,

for he drops the objective scientific tone otherwise observed and adopts a polemical one. It is presumably to this fact that such over-statements may be ascribed as "Of the students who take up the study of foreign languages in our schools and colleges, not one in a hundred attains even a fair reading knowledge, and not one in a thousand ever learns to carry on a conversation in the foreign language." While not of the opinion that this chapter on technical modern language pedagogy belongs here, the reviewer is heartily in accord with most of the views expressed. Briefly but convincingly the author shows the essential fallacy of the grammar-translation method as a "process of logical reference to a conscious set of rules" and "as a method of study, worthless, for it establishes associations in which the foreign words play but a small part as symbols (inexact symbols, of course) of English words". He then sketches how the direct method grows out of "a conscious or unconscious accordance with the fundamental processes of language learning and, for that matter, of speech in general". On a basis of sound psychology he explodes the myth that the power of learning languages wanes in adults.

In the following I shall take up some of the details in which the author seems to be in error or in which I disagree with him.

p. 4. The author speaks of the various systems of gesture-languages as "strikingly uniform". While not saying so in so many words he seems to imply that they are mutually intelligible. Wundt, upon whom the author "depends for his psychology, general and linguistic" (cf. Preface), says of the gesture-language of the South Italians that it is closely akin to that of savages in that many gestures have only symbolical significance, "wenn sie auch infolge der sehr verschiedenen Kulturbedingungen in der Beschaffenheit der gebrauchten Symbole erheblich abweicht" (Wundt: *Völkerpsychologie*, I. Band, I. Teil, 3. Auflage, p. 154). A Dakota Indian, for instance, would not understand a Neapolitan, even though he would sooner understand the gestures than the sound-language (Wundt p. 157).

p. 8. The noise made by crickets is cited as a type of audible expressive movement; Wundt says, "die Geräusche vieler Insekten, die durch das Aneinanderreiben horniger Teile des Hautskeletts entstehen, (gehören) weder nach ihren physiologischen Bedingungen noch wahrscheinlich nach ihrer psychologischen Funktion hierher" (p. 259).

p. 13. Even if the author follows Wundt in seeing the origin of language in audible expressive movements accompanying first pain and rage, then other intense emotions, he should not neglect to mention that Wundt says of recent investigations in this field, "dass sie durchweg eine wiederum

wachsende Hinneigung der allgemeinen Meinung zur Nachahmungstheorie bekunden" (2. Band, 2. Teil, p. 632).

p. 102. An instance of how language interpretation may go astray if it neglects historical method may be seen in the author's treatment of sound-variation in word-initial in Irish. He speaks of the semantic difference between the short forms of French *vous* and *a* and the longer ones employed in liaison, and then goes on to say, "An instance still farther along towards semantic differentiation occurs in Irish. This language has a sound-variation in word-initial which, however, does not depend upon the phonetic character of the preceding word-final, but arbitrarily on the preceding word; that is, Irish words may be divided into a number of otherwise arbitrary classes, according to the effect they have on a closely following word-initial. . . . This variation has semantic value in that it does not depend automatically on the adjoining sounds but implies a division of words into classes, etc.". He gives as illustrations: *tá ba* 'there are cows' but *a va* 'his cows'; *uv* 'an egg', *an tuv* 'the egg', *na nuv* 'of the eggs', *a huv* 'her egg', on p. 128 *bó* 'cow', *an vó* 'the cow', *ar mó* 'our cow, etc.

From the standpoint of elementary Modern Irish grammar the author's statements might be allowed to pass. Seen from the historical point of view, however, these variations in word-initial do depend on the phonetic character of the original preceding word-final. Most of the examples come under the following three rules of Irish sandhi:

1. lenition or aspiration: an initial stop sound was changed to an aspirate or a spirant after a word originally ending in a vowel. Here belong such examples as *a va* 'his cows', etc.

2. nasalization or eclipsis: after all words originally ending in -n, the nasal was pronounced before an initial vowel and the mediae. (This is only part of the rule). This explains *na nuv* 'of the eggs', the n being the original ending of the genitive plural; likewise *ar mó* 'our cow', the homorganic m appearing before b, and, in Irish, mb regularly becoming by assimilation mm or m.

3. gemination: after words which originally ended in -s or postvocalic t and k sounds. It is too complicated a phenomenon to be discussed fully here, but the result before an accented initial vowel was an h sound. This is the explanation of *a huv* 'her egg', *a* being an old feminine genitive.

an tuv is a parallel to English *an egg*, *a cow*, *ant* being used before vowels, *an* before consonants.

I do not wish to deny that these sandhi phenomena appear most consistently within semantically related groups; these, however, are not 'arbitrary classes' but depend automatically on the original adjoining sounds.

p. 109. When the author takes the three 'genders' of nouns as an illustration of "word classes which are not expressed by formalional similarity at all, but seem to go back, none the less, to emotional associations of the speakers", I believe the uninitiated reader is still uninitiated.

p. 145. "The Slavic languages distinguish categorically between, on the one hand, durative and iterative (in Slavic grammar called, together, 'imperfective') action . . . and on the other hand, punctual and terminative action (in Slavic grammar, together, 'perfective')". The author quotes here only the view of one school of Slavic grammarians, such as, for instance, Vondrak in his *Altkirchenslawische Grammatik*; Leskien, on the other hand, divides into 1. imperfective, 2. perfective, 3. iterative, but states that the iterative may be imperfective or perfective.

"He burst out weeping" does not strike me as 'inceptive terminative' but rather as 'inceptive durative'.

p. 145. In the list of Sanskrit 'conjugations' the *denominative* is omitted. The fact that it is not formed from the verb from which the other examples are derived is no reason for not including it in the list.

p. 152. As an example of stress-variation used as a means of morphologic sound-variation the author cites *address* with accent on the first syllable as noun, on the second as verb. The reviewer has often heard the former pronunciation, but it is not considered "correct".

p. 158. I think it unfortunate that the author feels it necessary to use the term *kernel* in place of the now generally used name *root*. It is loose usage to make *stem* and *root* synonymous, as is done here.

p. 206. In primitive Germanic the nominative and accusative singular of 'stone' are not * *stainoz*, * *stainon* respectively, but * *stainaz* and * *stainan*.

p. 220. In the discussion of the influence of language mixture in producing change in articulation, the substitution of the Indian for the Spanish basis of articulation in Chile is an interesting parallel to the assumed mingling of peoples speaking Dravidian and Indo-European languages. (Cf. R. Lenz: Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Amerikanospanischen, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie XVII, 158-214).

p. 224. The author prefers the name 'false analogy' to 'analogy', "because it conveys at least the idea of innovation, as opposed to the regular assimilative processes by which all speech is formed". The term 'false analogy' was given up in linguistics when the old belief, that analogical change like all language change indicated a deterioration of speech, was given up. Analogy is a regular process in all speech formation, so that there seems to be no ground for resuscitating the old expression.

p. 225. There is no basis for assuming that the numeral *four* in Primitive Indo-European may have begun with a uvular stop sound.

p. 229. Why the plural of Pre-Germanic *wasa is *wēzumé here but *wēzumún on p. 216 is not clear. However, either form is possible.

The author brings his task to a close by giving the reader good practical hints on how to begin the study of linguistics.

This "Introduction to the Study of Language" cannot help but be of great profit to the serious student. It is what the author intended it to be, "a summary of what is known about language". The whole book bears witness to the rare scholarship of the author. My regret is that he has not succeeded in making it in the best sense of the word "popular".

ALBERT W. ARON.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XL (1916), 1 and 2.

Pp. 5-17. Louis Haret. Entracts dans Térence. Donatus, our authority for the division of the plays of Terence into five acts—a division for which there is no MS warrant—is not always faithful to his own criterion of the close of an act, to wit, an empty stage. In the vulgate there is a flagrant violation of the rule at Ad. 854 where old Demea remained on the stage after he had been called in by his brother—‘i ergo intro’—a blunder that escaped even the critical eye of Bentley. There are yet other displacements—a further instance in the Adelphi, one in the Eunuchus, a third in the Andria, but we are assured that these are all that occur in the six plays. The cause of these displacements is to be sought in the transition from the distribution of the different acts among the performers to the continuous text for the behoof of the readers.

Pp. 18-32. Georges Lafaye. Le Modèle de l'Hécyre. There is a general agreement among scholars that the Hecyra of Terence is based upon the 'Εκυρά of Apollodorus of Carystos. But was there a secondary model and a consequent *contaminatio*? According to Sidonius Apollinaris, the secondary model was the 'Επιτρέποντες of Menander. The general theme of the Hecyra is so familiar to the *pallia* that it would readily admit extension and modification so that borrowing from the 'Επιτρέποντες was not a cogent necessity. Of this play of Menander, one of the most popular in Byzantine times < A. P. V 281, comp. A. J. P. XXXVIII 66 > we have recovered some six hundred verses and it is strange that there is no verse, no expression that shows evident imitation of the 'Επιτρέποντες. The *dramatis personae* have a family likeness and yet in the one similar scene the handling is very different. After all, Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of ‘similis’ not ‘eiusdem argumenti’. There may have been a 'Εκυρά of Menander but the *Graeca Menandru* of the Bembinus is too vague. In those later days Apollodorus of Carystos was a mere name. Even in Terence’s time the title of the 'Εκυρά may have run ‘Απολλοδώρου ἡ Μενάνδρου and that would account for the poet’s failure to mention his originals as he has frankly done elsewhere in his prologues. The cutting mentioned by Donatus (v. 825) has been attributed to a dislike on the part of the poet to bring a courtesan and matron face to face. The explanation given

by Donatus is doubtless the correct one. Profiting by previous experience, Terence resolved to abridge the play, and in fact the Hecyra is by far the shortest of the six pieces.

Pp. 33-37. François Garin. On the Greek MS Coislin 169 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. This MS containing Theocritus Id. I-XVIII and Moschus III does not deserve the consideration it has received at the hands of scholars from St. Amand to W. Christ. It is nothing but a copy of Laurentianus XXXII 16, a MS of the XIII century.

Pp. 37-46. Salomon Reinach. How one ceased to be a *colonus*. There were three periods of Roman colonization. Down to the time of the Gracchi the *coloni* were peasant soldiers and soldier peasants, the élite of the agricultural population. At the time of the Gracchi and Marius, the colonizers were the *plebs urbana* and professional soldiers, a poor lot of drifters and of worn-out men. The third and worst period was inaugurated by Marcus Aurelius, the most virtuous of Roman emperors and the unconscious instrument of the ruin of the Empire. In consequence of the long wars on the Danube and the frightful pestilence that devastated a large part of the Roman Empire the colonists were made up of German barbarians and transplanted masses of conquered populations. But at no period was there that 'return to the soil', which was supposed to be the ultimate inspiration of Vergil's Georgics. The *plebs urbana* wanted *panem et Circenses*—wanted the net result of the agriculture, not the agricultural life itself. But were the colonists permitted to sell or lease their lands? This was expressly forbidden to the 'limitanei' or soldiers who occupied the territories which belonged to the state, but there is no direct evidence whether or not the older *coloni* could alienate their assignments.

Pp. 47-48. P. d'Hérouville. Aristotle Eth. Nic. B., 9, 1109, a, 35. Κατὰ τὸν δεύτερον φάσι πλοῖον. There are two interpretations of δεύτερος πλοῦς. 1. Rowing instead of sailing, a *pisaller*. 2. After failure, try, try again. Stewart in his notes on the Nicomachean Ethics quotes as conclusive proof of the correctness of the former interpretation Menander ap. Stob. Flor. II, p. 349 (Meineke). Still, the context of the Nic. Eth. does not exclude the latter interpretation though the former is more satisfactory for Pol. I 13, 1284 b, 19. Comp. also Phileb. 19 C. The rival interpretation is suggested by the schol. on Phaedo 99 D, so that it seems worth while to quote in support of the *pisaller* interpretation two passages of St. Chrysostom Adv. oppugn. vitae monast. III 1 and Homil. I in Matt. 1—passages which shew the persistence of the proverb after seven centuries.

Pp. 49-50. L. Laurand. The repetition of the relative pronoun in Greek. In Latin the consecrated rule of representing

the second relative by the demonstrative is as much honoured in the breach as in the observance. Comp. Lebreton R. de phil. XXVII (1903), <A. J. P. XXV 343 and as for that matter G. L. (1894) 636>. M. Laurand desiderates an exhaustive examination of the parallel Greek usage and cites for the repetition of the relative Dem. 37, 46; 38, 19; 40, 2; Plato, Protag. 313 A, Rpb. 374 B; 396 C; 477 D; <562 B>.

Pp. 51-54. Georges Méautis. ΩΚΕΑΝΕ. Oxyrh. Pap. I 41, 4 for ὦκαναν ὠκαναν (bis) read Ωκεάνη. The Okeanos river of Homer and Hesiod had become to the Egyptians an equivalent of the Nile as a benefactor, as a nursing father.

Pp. 55-108. Georges Lafaye. Greek Litany of Isis. This interesting document published in a recent volume of the Oxyrh. Papyri is described, edited, and annotated with parallel passages from Apuleius and an index by the author of the paper, the wealth of which does not admit of condensation. Isis, patroness of suffragettes, had a wide cult in the second century as is shown by the long geographical introduction; the ascriptions are full of ritualistic music and one of them implies equality of men and women and is quite in accord with the spirit of our times.

Pp. 109-112. The Bulletin Bibliographique deals with Viljoen's Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata, Herbert Richards' Aristotelica, Aigrain's Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne.

Pp. 113-124. Pierre Boudreaux. Origin and formation of the scholia of Aristophanes. An anonymous grammarian towards the fourth-fifth century constituted the text of the eleven comedies and compiled the commentaries of Heliodoros, Symmachos, Phaeinos and sundry anonymous commentaries of varying number and value. He transcribed text and annotations on a parchment codex which became the archetype of our Byzantine recension. But by contaminations which were made during succeeding centuries, by collations of MSS of other provenience, by conjectures, by later additions, the copies of the same recension have been loaded unequally with foreign elements and the initial unity quickly gave place to a new diversity.

Pp. 125-132. Louis Havet. Plautus, Amph. 418, for 'a Telebois' read 'af Telebois'. Bacch. 51, before 'unum' insert 'hunc' and for 'perii' ex coni. read with Ritschl 'prope'. Cas. 311, for 'quam istam' read 'qua tu'. Cist. 7, read am <bae a m>e. Epid. 353, read His denumerauit manibus, is suam natam quam esse credit. Merc. 847, for 'inuenturus' read 'inuentus res' and for 'dedi' read 'dedit'. Poen. 968 P (969 A) 969 P (968 A). The order of both A and P is faulty. 968 A is not by Plautus, and our text is the result of attempts

to fill a gap. Delete the peccant verse and read: *Creta est profect<o anim>o horunc hominum oratio.* Trin. 48: O amice <mi> salve. l. 296. for 'neu' and 'neue' read 'nei' and 'neiue'. In like manner 183 read 'sei' for 'seu'. 538 for 'omnia mea' read 'omnia mala'. Truc. 181 read:

Amantes si qui non danunt, non didici fabulari.
... Amanti si cui quid dabo, "non est" non didici fari.

P. 132. Louis Havet defends 'parcepromus' against 'parcipromus' on the analogy of 'genetrix', and integrum. The *è* is due to the influence of the contiguous *r*.

Pp. 133-134. Franz Cumont. Isis Latina. In the Isis Litany v. 104 for Ααρείνη read Ααειτην (= 'Ααειτην). In Persia the planet Venus was not consecrated to Isis but to Anahita. Yet according to certain astrological theories Venus was the star of Isis.

Pp. 135-137. Louis Havet. Cicero, Verrines. Emendations 4, 9. 16. 35. 49. 56. 65. 121.

Pp. 138-140. Louis Havet. Emendations to Aurelius Victor.

Pp. 140-141. Louis Havet. Emendations to Varro, R. R.

Bulletin Bibliographique, containing reviews of Fowler's Gathering of the Clans (A.J.P. XXXVIII 209 ff.). Paul Lejay says: 'Le livre de M. Fowler est un de ces livres ingénieux et séduisants que l'Angleterre nous donne souvent, et où se mêlent les fantaisies un peu risquées de l'amateur, les intuitions d'un lecteur sensible et la science éveillée d'un érudit sage'. Cuj, Une statistique de locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale <A.J.P. XXXVIII 96 ff.>. Argumentation précise et solide (Victor Chapot). Coccchia, Lucio Apuleio (A. J. P. XXXVIII 317 ff.). The reviewer, M. Victor Chapot, is not convinced.

Revue des revues—which shews that the Revue de Philologie is encountering the same difficulties that have hampered the reports of the A. J. P.

B. L. G.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLV (1917).

Fascicolo 3.

Gli 'scholia vetera in Theocriti Idyllia' nel Codice Estense greco 87 (377-401). Francesco Garin discusses the value and relations of this manuscript and gives the variant readings. It contains a great many good readings. Curiously enough it anticipates a number of readings which in our modern text are due to the conjecture of later scholars.

La condizione giuridica della Grecia dopo la distruzione di Corinto nel 146 a. Ch. (402-423). Vincenzo Costanzi discusses the political condition of Greece after the departure of Mummius. The discussion is based on the summary given by Pausanias, VII 16, 9-10. Costanzi's conclusion is that when in 27 B. C. Greece was made the province of Achaea and given a proconsul of its own, the Romans merely gave official recognition to a state of things which had already existed for a long time.

Di un'epigrafe cristiana recentemente scoperta e di un graffito pompeiano restituito nella sua lezione (424-428). Pietro Rasi discusses at some length two inscriptions: a Christian epitaph published by Fornari in the *Notizie degli Scavi* 1916, p. 126, and a Pompeian graffiti published by Della Corte in the same journal, p. 286.

Per l'epigramma in onore del pittore Marcus Plautius (429-431). Arnaldo Beltrami comments on the famous epigram in honor of the painter Marcus Plautius in the temple of Juno Regina at Ardea as reported by Pliny, N. H. XXXV, 115.

Post XL Annos (432-434). Ettore Stampini contributes a long and well written inscription commemorating his 40 years of academic life.

Recensioni (435-442).

Note bibliografiche (442-444).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (445-453).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (454-456).

Fascicolo 4.

Notizie di Papiri Ercolanesi inediti (457-466). Domenico Bassi publishes some few fragments of (Pap. 57) Philodemus, II[*epi*] Ma[*vias*]. This is one of the few papyri, the author and title of which have been preserved. It was completely unrolled in 1805. The fragments of text here published are not especially significant and Bassi adds no commentary upon them.

Le "Fenicie" di Seneca (467-515). Umberto Moricca discusses the authenticity of the Phoenissae of Seneca, the theories of Leo, Braun, Werner, Heinse, Richter and others regarding the origin and present condition of the play, etc. His careful study of style, phraseology and situations convinces him and is likely to convince the reader that the play is by Seneca and that it was meant to be written just as it is. Particularly interesting is the comparison of the final scene with Livy's account of Coriolanus and his mother Veturia (Livy II, 39-40). Moricca makes it quite clear that Seneca was strongly influenced by this famous passage of the historian. The article is to be continued.

Cortesie da Desco (516-520). Luigi Valmaggi concludes that the use of the fork was not general in any period in antiquity. Certainly the Middle Ages were guiltless of it; in the Age of Elizabeth it was a curiosity; in this country it is less than a generation since the fork assumed a number of functions previously exercised by a knife. Indeed no longer ago than 1749 the author of a French book on deportment (quoted by Valmaggi) feels obliged to warn his gentle reader that "if they serve you meat it is not good manners to take it in your hand." Valmaggi also quotes another gem from Croce's *Cinquanta cortesie da tavola* (1609) :

Cerca alla mensa star pulito e netto
E il naso mai in man non ti moccare
Ma porta teco sempre il fazzoletto.

There may be some who assume that warnings of this sort are unnecessary in this day and generation, but anyone who has lived long enough to look about him and remember what he sees is quite well aware of the fact that the naïveté of our forefathers by no means perished with them.

Nuovi riscontri classici al Parini (521-523). Luigi Valmaggi points out and discusses some of G. Parini's imitations of the classics (Mezzogiornale 462 ff.; Vespro 194 ff., Alla Musa 1).

Recensioni (524-528).

Note bibliografiche (528-529).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (530-534).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (535-536).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

BRIEF MENTION.

For a number of years I might have called myself ‘parcus <Sophoclis> cultor et infrequens’. Perhaps I was a little tired of expounding the perfections of the son of Sophilos, the only dramatist I taught in my regular classes during my twenty years’ service at the University of Virginia (A. J. P. XXXVII 383). I cannot say, as did the late Dr. Verrall, that in Sophokles there was no man to be discovered behind the artist, at least no man whom he (Verrall) would greatly care to know (A. J. P. XXXV 492). Indeed at one time I should have shewn a Tam o’ Shanter readiness to sacrifice what no Greek wore for ‘ae blink’ of that ‘bonnie burdie’ as he led the choral dance in honour of the victory of Salamis: and at a much later day I manifested my sympathy with Sophokles, the aged, by giving the right interpretation to that famous dictum about love which Cicero either did not or would not understand (A. J. P. XXX 4). Sophokles, the artist, I have toiled after in translation; and in my Essays and Studies I have undertaken to vindicate the actuality of his dramaturgy by an analysis of the career of Maximilian of Mexico. But for a considerable part of my teaching of Sophokles, Sophokles meant Jebb (A. J. P. XVII 390) and Jebb is another piece of perfection that has kept me these many years discontented with the crudeness of my own workmanship (A. J. P. XXVI 491); and, to confess a human weakness, I was comforted when after the great Greecian had withdrawn his cool radiance from lesser stars and flaring bonfires I read that in the eyes of a writer in Blackwood’s Magazine Jebb’s translations were bald. Bald! But so are the mountains of Greece and so are the chrysolite Isles of Greece. Thasos was wooded in the old times, ὅλης ἀγρίης ἐπωτεφής, but that was no recommendation in the eyes of Archilochos. Passing as I did once by a rather sudden transition from Greece to Heidelberg, I resented the lushness of the woodland scenery of Germany as one would resent hypertrichosis (A. J. P. XXXVII 108) on the face of a beautiful woman, not to cite the Μούσα παιδική.¹ To understand Jebb as to understand Sophokles demands study, demands insight and if from time to time I have tented holes in the great scholar’s coat, it was only to assert the right of the humblest grammarian to in-

¹ A. J. P. XXXVIII 63.

dependent vision. I do not emulate the lint-picker of Jebb's Theophrastus (A. J. P. XXX 228). Neither σκορακισμός for the lowliest nor κροκυδισμός for the highest. Bald! Well! δότε τῷ φαλακρῷ.

To come back to my temporary neglect of Sophokles. It is after all well to lay an old favorite aside for a while. 'Voluptates commendat rarius usus' is as true of intellectual enjoyments, is as true of the enjoyments that come from reading, as of those meant by Lucretius. But there are haunting verses, haunting melodies that linger in the least tenacious memory. I am a Grecian at least to the extent that I value poetry for life—not as 'a criticism of life'. μὴ γένοιτο. My friends accuse me of a wearisome repetition of συκρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εἰνάζει ρόπη to which I have not been ashamed to give a sporty¹ translation (A. J. P. XXXI 147). The prayer ξὺν ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι has been on my lips and in my heart ever since I entered into the penumbra of old age and heard of the exit of a comrade of my youth (A. J. P. XXII 114), though I have been tempted to substitute πεσῆματι for πηδῆματι, too violent an action for an old scholar. Then there are verses that make strange music in one's ear. Tastes differ—but I have long loved these lines of Deianeira

ὦ Ζεῦ, τὸν Οἴτης ἄπομονὸς λειμῶν' ἔχει,
ἔδωκας ἡμῖν ἀλλὰ σὸν χρόνῳ χαράν.

with their play of stress and accent. Nor is the sentiment alien. The sense arides me as well as the sound. For so much has come to me late in life, among other things this 'riant nook' of *Brief Mention*.

Of those 'coups de fouet' that cut to the heart, Sophokles is a past master. He is no whit behind Aischylos. I think of Iokasta's ἀλις νοσοῦσ' ἐγώ as I think of Kassandra's ἀρκείτω βίος. It is these dramatic μάστιγες, these stabs, as it were, that tell on the modern reader. χωρεῖ πρὸς ἥπαρ γενναίᾳ δύῃ. As for the γνῶμαι, those wise saws, of which the practical Greeks were so fond, those bits of proverbial philosophy which orators like Aischines seemed to consider the be-all and end-all of poetry—we can find all we want in the monostichs that Kock bundled out of his Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, we can find a lot of them in Publilius Syrus. The old editions are apt to mark these floscules of sententiousness. Taubmann's Plautus, the

¹ For *βέτειν* in the field of 'sport', comp. Pind. O. 9. 98: δέιρεται δόλῳ.

first entire Plautus I ever owned, puts these admirable reflexions in majuscules—a capital arrangement for example hunters. ‘Pauvre prestre’, said Scaliger of Taubmann, ‘son Plaute ne sera pas grand cas’. Still it is better to fish in Taubmann than to cast one’s net at random in Lewis and Short, as some grammarians have done to their hurt.¹ Pindar has gnomes enough to stock a calendar but as has been urged and well urged, the dramatic situation must be studied and scholars should not imitate the good ladies who cite unthinkingly the strange woman of the Proverbs of Solomon. In a discourse by Viscount Bryce as President of the British Academy before the Great War got into full swing one reads these calmly philosophic words, which produce a strange effect when taken in connexion with the same eminent historian’s subsequent report on matters in Belgium.

Every one among us must sometimes have had cause to regret, when reading them years afterwards, words which he wrote in the heat of the moment. Time modifies our judgment as it cools our passions. Neither the friendships nor the enmities of nations can last forever. You remember how Ajax, in the drama of Sophokles, says that he has learnt

ὅτι ἔχθρος τμῆμα τοσνός ἔχθρεώς,
ώς καὶ φίλησσων αὐθεῖς.

It is a stock quotation. In his Recollections Lord Morley refers to the sentiment a couple of times though he is vague as to the source. Of the wisdom of that sage reflexion, who is better aware than one who sang with heart and soul a song very popular in a section of our common country once known as the Confederate States,

You can never win us back
Never, never,
Though we perish in the track
Of our endeavor?

ώς καὶ φίλησσων αὐθεῖς.

But in the mouth of Ajax the lines just quoted have the tang of Sophoklean bitterness than which there is little more bitter in all literature.

Much has been written about Euripides as a δικανικὸς ποιητής. But no fifth century Attic poet was free from the sophistic influence that made itself felt in every department of life. Aischylos was not free from it, nor Sophokles any more than his contemporary Herodotos. The Kreon of the Antigone is an archsophist, as has been noted. He had the same creed as the

¹ A. J. P. XXXII 116.

Pangermanist of to-day, and to those who hate to give up the Germany of other days, there is a certain comfort in reading what Goethe said to Eckermann: 'Man sollte überhaupt nie eine Handlungsweise eine Staatstugend nennen, die gegen die Tugend im allgemeinen geht'. The passage is cited in the tenth edition of the Schneidewin-Nauck Antigone. It will doubtless disappear from post-bellum editions, if there will be any post-bellum editions of the Antigone or any post-bellum for some of us oldsters.

From the first emergence of the word *σοφιστής* we have to do with rhetoric, which may be called the official robe of the sophist. A later development is the quest of *ποικιλία*, a subject which has interested me for years, an interest which has left traces in the Journal (e. g. XVI 92 f. n.; XXIX 120; XXXV 231). The antithesis to *ποικιλία* is repetition (*παλιλλογία*); not rhetorical anaphora but simple repetition without stress. The subject which I barely touched on in my Pindar (P. I. 80; 9, 123) is taken up and expanded by Schroeder in his Proleg. II. 94. Repetition of this sort is common enough in Sophokles. It has nothing to do with the recurrent word, the so-called 'key word' (A. J. P. II 500; XII 94); nothing to do, for instance, with *ἢ κακὴ φάτος* which might be considered the motif of the Ajax (187-193) nor with the *φρονεῖν* (A. J. P. XXXVIII 337) recently discussed in the Journal. Variety for sheer variety's sake has been denounced by Pascal (A. J. P. XXIX 120) as foolery, and Johnson has been charged with it, often unjustly. We moderns are completely under the domination of the goddess *Ποικιλία* so that Campbell in treating of Repetition in Sophokles apologizes for what he calls 'accidental repetition'. 'Modern languages', he says, 'are more precise and exacting than the ancient . . . in not allowing the same word to be used twice, unless for special reasons, in the same passage. This requirement', he admits, 'runs counter to a natural proclivity, as all must be aware who have had occasion to correct a hastily written letter'. This mania for variation came in at a later period. Sophokles was too healthy to yield to what was originally artificial but has now become ingrained in all modern literature, and notably so in English style. Examples abound, but few are so frank as Mr. PATON in his translation of the Anthology VII 103:

*καὶ βίοις καθαρὸς σοφίας ἐπὶ θείον ἔκβομει
αὐτῷ δυτρέπτοις δόγμασι πειθόμενος.*

He renders 'A pure pursuit of wisdom, obedient to their unswerving doctrines, adorned their divine lives'. 'Life', he

adds in a footnote, 'life is the Greek, but English will not bear the repetition'.

Well, we are all tarred with the same stick, sheep of the same fold. True, Sophokles, I fancy, would not have apologized for the repetition of *χρόνῳ* (El. 1292-3). A. J. P. XXXIV 106, line 11 from bottom, one reads: 'She too had caught the *music* and answered him in his own *music*'. But I am not to be credited with the second 'music' for I am an unhealthy modern. I had written 'measure' and my friend, Professor Manatt, who happened to be interested in the passage pointed out the repetition as one would point out a typographical error. I have made a number of additions to Professor Campbell's lists and intended to compare Sophokles' usage with that of modern masters but the subject is well worn¹ and besides, before parting with Sophokles, I wish to make a note or two on Mr. PEARSON's edition of the fragments of the poet.

Mr. PEARSON, as we all know, is well qualified for his task, which he took up in succession to Walter Headlam, and Mr. PEARSON is a keen grammarian (A. J. P. XXXII 361 foll.). The Hellenist readers of the Journal will doubtless remember his article On the use of *όταν* with causal implication (A. J. P. XXXIII 426-433) to which he has referred repeatedly in his commentary on the fragments. It would have been asking too much of a rival interpreter that he should have added a reference to my discussion of the matter, which to his mind was neither novel nor convincing (l. c. 469 foll.). But in these notes I shall steer clear of grammar.

In his note on Sophokles' EPIX p. 139 Mr. PEARSON records Welcker's strange blunder in confounding Θέμις, the πάρεδρος Διός (Pind. O. 8. 22), nay, the ἀλοχός Διός (fr. 30) with Θέτις for whose hand Zeus and Poseidon were rivals (I. 8, 27). After such a lapse one almost forgives Bréal (A. J. P. XXXVII 112) for making Thetis a daughter of Zeus. Dindorf, as Mr.

¹ However, as I am reading this *Brief Mention* in its final form, I see that a correspondent of the London Times (Jan. 17) has rushed into print in order to convince Tennyson of sin for repeating, within short compass, the word 'land' in his *Lotus Eaters* and has in like manner impaled Matthew Arnold for repeating the word 'streams' in *Sohrab and Rustum*; and the subject is resumed by A. B. Cook in the same newspaper for Jan. 31.

PEARSON notes, makes the same mistake but he might have added that Dindorf cites a passage from Plato, Rphl. 2, 379 E which ought to have opened his eyes: οὐδὲ θεῶν ἔριν τε καὶ κρίσιν διὰ Θέμιτός τε καὶ Διός and actually quotes the Θεομαχία. ἔριν was evidently too much for him and yet Mr. PEARSON has to say that Welcker opened a new epoch and that his book is as readable as it was when it was first printed. ‘He was a great man’ said Bolingbroke of Marlborough, ‘and I have forgotten all his faults’ (A. J. P. XXXIV 232). Otto Jahn compared Welcker’s learning to the dust on a butterfly’s wing. What if the dust got into his eyes sometimes? In the Educational Supplement to the London Weekly Times for November 8, 1917, there is a long article On the Significance of Howlers, the lesson being the folly of cramming children with proper names that have no real meaning for them. The significance of howlers in the case of professed scholars is far different. For one thing it is a lesson in the practice of *ἐπιείκεια*, an acquired virtue for most of us. The article is furnished with abundant and, of course, amusing illustrations, many of which can be capped by any one who has had dealings with printer’s devil and ignorant copyist. Still where are the eyes of the proof-readers? In the ends of the earth? Hence the not infrequent lamentations of the Journal. Still there is some comfort to be had from some of the mistakes that cross the reader’s path, such as Lesbian women for Lemnian women, strange bedfellows, and Cynic and Cyrenaic, which may be called a parallel. Flaxman’s Parting of Nestor and Andromache set me off on an Imaginary Conversation after the pattern of Landor. If I had carried out my plan I should at least have avoided the confusion of Pindar with Simonides (A. J. P. XXXIV 238), and should not have quoted Ovid in a fifth century b. c. letter as he did in Pericles and Aspasia. But I would rather have written Rose Aylmer than a score of Greek Syntaxes, as I would rather have written A Shropshire Lad than edited Manilius. So readily does a man revert to his old loves.

No one who has had any experience in dealing with technical terms and processes in antiquity but has had occasion to get his knuckles rapped. My study of *examen* Pers. I 6, 7 is not a pleasant memory for me. Comp. Postgate, A. J. P. VI 462. And when it comes to ships and shipwrights, old salts and unvoyaged landlubbers alike are at odds, one can’t say ‘at sea’. I have a note on this apropos of Timotheos’ Πέρσαι (A. J. P. XXIV 226). On Pindar N. 6. 57, Sir John Sandys has a long note about the meaning of πὰρ ποδὶ. The passage runs: τὸ δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ ναὸς ἐλισσόμενον αἰεὶ κυμάτων | λέγεται παντὶ μάλιστα δονεῖν

θυμόν. As I have indicated (A. J. P. XXXVI 232) δονεῖν refers to seasickness, but the passage has been overlooked by Professor Rolfe in his article on that disagreeable disorder, not to repeat the word 'seasickness' (A. J. P. XXV 192–200). Every one who has been much at sea will recognize the propriety of the figure in his own case or that of others. In the same sphere my attention has been called to Mr. PEARSON's note on Sophokles, frag. 143:

ὡς ναοφύλακες νυκτέρους ναυκληρίας
πλήκτροις ἀπευθύνουσιν οὐράν τρόπιν.

Does ναυκληρία mean 'voyage' or as Campbell contends 'ship'? In either case Mr. PEARSON maintains that there is a pleonasm against which one of my correspondents rightly protests. The ναοφύλακες are the ship-watch mentioned P. 4.41, who doubtless took their turns at the rudder under the κυβερνήτης. ναυκληρία is the ship as Campbell maintains, ναύκληρος the master. PEARSON's 'pleonasm' recalls the blunder of Grote who mixed up ναύκληρος and κυβερνήτης in his interpretation of the famous similitude in Plato's Republic VI 488 and made a mess of it.

Dean WEST has collected the testimonies of a cloud of witnesses to the *Value of the Classics* (Princeton University Press), testimonies borne by men who have no commercial, no professional interest in the maintenance of the traditional scheme of college studies. Appended to these impressive deliverances there is a formidable array of statistics drawn up in refutation of those other statistics that have been used only too effectively to stir up the pure minds of believers in Latin and Greek. My missionary days are long overpast and statistics have lost whatever charm they had for me even in the syntactical line, but the book will strengthen the feeble knees of those who are afraid that they will have to bow down themselves in the house of Rimmon. Among the usual topics the inevitable question of translation comes up repeatedly. One of the most quotable passages is by Justice HOLMES who says (p. 233): 'It seems to me that people who think that they are enjoying Euripides, for instance, in the charming translations that we know, probably are getting their pleasure from a modern atmosphere that is precisely what is not in the original.' This is the judicial way of expressing what John Jay Chapman means when sometime ago he dared to call Gilbert Murray an 'ignis fatuus'. A Hoosier writer of note, to whom Gilbert Murray and the son of Kleito are as one, tells of the 'wild songs of Euripides'. There are wood-notes in Euripides but one hesitates at 'wild'. And the same

author quotes with ecstasy, not the somewhat prosaic tag with which Euripides winds up five of his plays with a contemptuous fling, as it were, at the departing spectators, but the poetical vesture with which the interpreter has endued the δέσμον:

Great treasure halls hath Zeus in heaven,
From whence to man strange dooms be given,
 Past hope or fear.
And the end men looked for cometh not,
And a path is there where no man thought:
 So hath it fallen here.

Fifty years ago in a spirit of mischief I called this passage a 'wretched tail-piece' (*Essays and Studies*, p. 194), and wrote a burlesque version, which has been quoted and misunderstood. Here is a variant:

A box of surprises hath Zeus in the skieses,¹
And much that is odd's fulfilled by the gods;
That comes not about for which you look out;
That God doth effect what you don't expect:
And such was the end of this story.

Honour bright, which is closer to the original?

W. P. M.: *Horace and his Age*: A Study in Historical Background. By J. F. D'ALTON, Professor at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Longmans, Green & Co.: London and New York, 1917. Pp. xii + 296. \$2.00 net. This is a study of the serious side of Horace, an attempt "to view him in the light of the various movements of his time, to recapture, as it were, the atmosphere in which he moved, to estimate a portion at least of the influences under which many of his thoughts were bodied forth." The special topics discussed are, his position in Roman politics, his religion and philosophy, his attitude toward various social problems and various popular beliefs, and his work as a literary critic. It is shown that Horace, as long as he continued to write, reflects, with a good deal of fidelity, the various phases of Roman Imperial policy, that his philosophic thought in the Epistles is predominantly Stoic, etc. The last chapter contains a very careful study of the development of drama at Rome. The whole book is well written, and well made.

¹A meticulous writer, I always seek literary warrant for anything unusual. With 'skieses' compare 'treeses' in Addison's 'And the breezes fan the treeses | Full of blossoms bright and gay. (*The Guardian*, No. CXXIV.) 'Box of surprises' is a manner of equivalent for 'glory-hole', the name that ship-stewards give to their reserves of dainties, and so I have not been untrue to the *rapides*-motif of the original.

Another good book which should be promptly mentioned here is a very complete edition of the Eighth Book of Lucan's Civil War, by Professor J. P. POSTGATE, of the University of Liverpool (Cambridge : at the University Press, 1917. Pp. cxii + 146. 3s. net). The introduction treats of the last days of Pompey, with excursuses on the route and chronology of his flight, and on various questions of ethnography and geography ; there are twelve pages of critical apparatus, and a hundred pages of explanatory notes. The book is very carefully printed ; one lonely flaw is the omission of the word *ius* in the quotation from Seneca, 642 n. The note on *lapsus*, 8, is not very clear.

R. V. D. M.: Three new volumes of *Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Histoire de France* have lately appeared. Under the imprint 1914 is the *Recueil des Actes de Louis IV, Roi de France* (936-954) by the archivist and palaeographer M. PHILIPPE LAUER. The introduction (pp. i-lxxv) discusses the Royal Chancellory, the palaeographical minutiae of the MSS, and the matter of the invocation, preamble, subject-matter, and protocol. Pages 1-151 are taken up with the texts themselves and the index, and that is followed by 8 plates of MS facsimiles, monograms, and seals.

Professor H. FRANÇOIS DELABORDE issued in 1916 the first volume of his *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste, Roi de France*, Tome I, Années du règne I à XV (1^{er} Nov. 1179—31 Oct. 1194) (pp. XL + 574), and M. ELIE BERGER published the posthumous work of M. LÉOPOLD DELISLE, *Recueil des Actes de Henri II, Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France*, Tome I (pp. VII + 587). These two large volumes are a continuation of the splendid series being published under the care and direction of L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

In the Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Tome XL) there has also just appeared a short but valuable study by M. HENRI OMONT, under the title *Minoïde Mynas et ses missions en Orient* (1840-1855).

Under the auspices of the same academy there appeared in 1915, Tome V of the Recueil des Historiens de la France, entitled *Pouillés de la province de Trèves*, published by MM. AUGUSTE LONGNON and l'abbé VICTOR CARRIÈRE (pp. LXVIII + 600). This carefully edited volume contains lists of the benefices and their taxations, of the four dioceses of the ecclesiastical province of Trèves, namely, Metropolitan Trèves, Metz, Toul, and Verdun.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE ON THE OPENING WORDS OF THE ODYSSEY OF LIVIUS ANDRONICUS.

I chanced a few evenings ago to be looking through *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXXV, when my own name in a footnote (p. 17) caught my eye. It was in an article by Mr. Charles Knapp, and at this particular point, while crediting me with both 'good' and 'bad' comment on Livius Andronicus, he says I am 'dead' to two points which he mentions in connection with the first line of Livius' *Odyssey*, namely that in *Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*, the word *insece* is a good rendering of ἐνετε and *versutum* of πολύτροπον. Mr. Knapp has curiously, but I am sure unintentionally, misread the quotation which he gives quite correctly from my *Literary History of Rome*. So far was I from failing to see the obvious appropriateness of these Latin words that I deliberately contrasted the faithfulness of Livius at his start with his loose renderings—whether we call them translation or paraphrase—at later points. My words were "The extant specimens prove that he can positively mistranslate, and that he does not maintain the fidelity of the familiar opening words:—*Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*"; and I added a footnote quoting the Greek ἄνδρα μοι ἐνετε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον (*Lit. Hist. of Rome*, p. 124). Mr. Knapp must have understood the words to mean that Livius does not maintain fidelity to the opening words—a very different matter. I should like to assure him that I fully appreciate the danger of judging Livius too absolutely from fragments, and in fact gave a caution on "the customary difficulties in forming a critical judgment on an author represented by no one passage of length", and whose "surviving fragments do not amount to a hundred lines" (*Lit. Hist. of Rome*, p. 122). To my mind the great thing about Livius is his historical importance. Under that head I estimate him as highly as any other critic has done; and I very gladly agree with Mr. Knapp that Mommsen—always less convincing in literary than in historical pronouncements—was too severe in his arraignment of Andronicus's renderings and paraphrases.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

ARMSTRONG COLLEGE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, ENGLAND.

My attention has been called to the fact that in A. J. P. XXXV 17, n. 3, I misinterpreted certain words which I quoted from Mr. J. W. Duff's book, *A Literary History of Rome*, 124. I refer to the words "he does not maintain the fidelity of the familiar opening words:—*Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*". I see now, what I should have seen before, that Mr. Duff meant to tell us that, in his judgment, Livius' opening line, in contrast to other lines by him, was a faithful rendering of the Greek. I am sorry that I failed to see this, particularly because I have a very high opinion of Mr. Duff's book. Yet I may say in self-defence that to insert as a subordinate element of a discussion of a man's inaccuracies (a discussion which covers 15 lines) a reference to one excellent and faithful rendering seems to me unfortunate. Had I caught Mr. Duff's true meaning I should of course have begun my note in a different way, but I am constrained to say that the main part of it, the part beginning "The number of fragments whose place is uncertain" would be unchanged. Our studies of early Latin literature will remain untrustworthy so long as we keep forgetting that even Archimedes needed a ποῦ στῶ.

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Probuerunt.

I ask leave to protest against the statement on p. 410 (postscript) of the last number of the American Journal of Philology that "metrical stress . . . brought about the portentous 'probuerunt'", in my version of Professor Housman's 'Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries' published in the Literary Supplement of the Times of Nov. 8, 1917.

In the line in question

rerum probuerunt ob aes ruinam

I originally wrote a different verb which I changed in order to give the Lucretian colour that seemed to suit the subject and the original. Of the two passages which I cited one (I 977) contains a form *probeat* = *prohibeat* which may be maintained to be due to 'metrical stress' and one (III 864) a form *probet* which cannot; for it is not to be supposed that Lucretius could not get *prohibet* into his verse. A more reasonable supposition is that *probeo* is a contraction of the same kind as *praebeo* and *debeo* and that the scansion *probuerunt* would not have seemed more 'portentous' to Lucretius than the scansion *præbuērunt* seemed to Ovid, Amores I 14.

25. *Heroides* II 142. And what was good enough for Lucretius is good enough for me.

J. P. POSTGATE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, Feb. 21, 1918.

In curious accord with the spirit of the anonymous critic who accused me of a seven-footed hexameter (A. J. P. XXXV 234), Professor Postgate implies my ignorance of a familiar fact in Latin Prosody (G.-L. 131, 5; 722). The combination of the two liberties involved in the line which he defends seemed to me 'portentous' and both due to metrical stress, but if the Great War has robbed me of the 'iucunda senectus' for which I had hoped, it has not affected the 'mite | inge-nium' to which I lay claim and I apologize for the word 'por-tentous', an epithet which I forbore to apply to a flaw in classical research for which the future author of Flaws in Classical Research was responsible (A. J. P. IV 208 fn.).

B. L. G.

NECROLOGY.

JAMES RIGNALL WHEELER.

1859-1918.

In his *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, M. Maurice Croiset says of the ancient Greek: "L'Hellène a toujours eu de la raison dans l'imagination, de l'esprit dans le sentiment, de la réflexion dans la passion. Jamais on ne le voit entraîné totalement d'un seul côté. Il a, pour ainsi dire, plusieurs facultés prêtes pour chaque chose, et c'est en les associant qu'il donne à ses créations leur véritable caractère." In our modern world and especially in these troublous and passionate times this finely tempered rationality, the 'master-light of all our seeing,' appears the more desirable as our need of it is greater. Observing the harm done to worthy causes by ardent extremists, one has a quickened sense of the value in human intercourse of this equipoise of mind, this alert yet controlled idealism. Some such train of thought must have come to many in connection with the recent death, on February 9, of Professor James R. Wheeler. Not only did he inculcate unweariedly this liberal habit of mind;

he was in his daily life and conversation an example of the nature of its winning power. In an address delivered in 1907 at the opening exercises of the academic year at Columbia University he defined the idea of liberal education in words that to those who knew him seemed to be entirely applicable to his own personality: "It is a very old idea," he said, "and it is profoundly ethical in nature, having to do with what Aristotle has called a *έτις ψυχής*, a spiritual condition, which grows out of the direction and quality of our mental activity, and which determines our way of looking at things. The man who has fully grasped it will have soberness and righteousness and wisdom, and like that great poet of antiquity, he will 'see life steadily and see it whole'". This high serenity of spirit in which *sine ira et studio* Mr. Wheeler addressed himself to the complicated problems of scholarship and of administration had fruitful results in many forms of activity. He taught in succession at Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Vermont, and Columbia, and in the last named university not only gave instruction in Greek literature, art and archaeology, but was for five years, 1906-1911, dean of the faculty of fine arts. He served from 1894 to 1901 as secretary and since 1901 as chairman of the managing committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In 1914 he became an alumni trustee of his Alma Mater, the University of Vermont, and in 1916 a member of the municipal art commission of New York City. He was associate editor of the American Journal of Archaeology, and in collaboration with Professor H. N. Fowler published in 1909 an admirable *Handbook of Greek Archaeology*. In all these activities the fineness of his scholarship and taste was readily discernible. These standards he held high and was uncompromising in their defence. But he commended his teaching of the Greek spirit most of all by expressing it in his own life with characteristic simplicity, humor, and unfailing courtesy.

NELSON G. McCREA.

CORRIGENDUM.

In the last number of the Journal, p. 460, l. 5 from bottom, read
G. Birkbeck Hill.

C. W. E. M.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

American Academy in Rome. Memoirs of the academy. V. I, School of Classical Studies 1915-16. New York, *The Academy* (101 Park Ave.), 1917. 172 pp. il. pls. facsms. fig. fol. bds. \$5.

Browne (Rev. H. J.) Our renaissance; essays on the reform and revival of classical studies; with a preface by Sir Frederic Kenyon. New York, *Longmans*. 16 + 281 pp. 8°. \$2.60 net.

Butler (Leo T.) Exercises in Latin versification. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1917. 7 + 149 pp. 12°. 75 c.

Constans (Léopold). Chrestomathie de l'ancien français (IX^e-XV^e siècles); précédée d'un tableau sommaire de la littérature française au moyen âge; suivie d'un glossaire étymologique détaillé; ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Troisième édition soigneusement revue. New York, *G. E. Stechert*. 244 pp. 8°. \$2 net.

Cooper (Lane). Greek Genius and Its Influence; select essays and extracts; with an introd. New Haven, Ct., *Yale University*. 350 pp. 8°. \$3.50 net.

D'Alton (J. F.) Horace and his Age; a study in historical background. New York, *Longmans*. 12 + 296 pp. 12°. \$2 net.

Fowler (W. Warde). Aeneas at the Site of Rome. Observations on the eighth book of the Aeneid. New York, *Longmans*. 9 + 128 pp. 12°. \$1.50 net.

Glover (Terrot Reaveley). From Pericles to Philip. New York, *Macmillan*. 11 + 405 pp. 8°. \$3 net.

Grandgent (C. Hall). The Ladies of Dante's Lyrics. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*. 181 pp. 8°. \$1.35 net.

Greek Anthology (The). With English trans. by W. R. Paton. (In 5 vols.) Vol. 3. 18°. 256 pp. (Loeb Classical lib.) *Heinemann*, 1917. 5s. net; 1lhr. 6s. 6d. net.

Guthrie (K. S.) Numenius of Apamea, the Father of Neo-Platonism: Works, Biography, Message, Sources and Influence. 8°. 219 pp. *Lusac*, 1917. 5s.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. V. XXVIII. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*, 1917. 8°. bds. \$1.50 net.

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus). The Odes and Secular Hymn of Horace. Englished into rimed verse corresponding to the original meters by Warren H. Cudworth. New York, *A. A. Knopf*. 20 + 161 pp. 12°. \$1.50 net.

Mackenzie (Donald A.) Myths of Crete and Pre-Hellenic Europe. 415 pp. 8°. *Gresham Pub. Co.*, 1917. 10s. net.

Mainwaring (C. I.) and Paine (W. I.) Secundus annus. Cr. 8°. 102 pp. (Direct method: Lingua Latina.) *Milford*, 1917. 2s. 6d.

More (Paul Elmer). Platonism. Lectures delivered at Princeton University, October 29, 30, 31, November 6, 7, 1917. Princeton, N. J.,

Princeton University Press. 11 + 307 pp. diagr. 8°. (Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation lectures for 1917-1918). \$1.75 net.

Petrie (W. M. Flinders). *Scarabs and Cylinders.* With names illustrated by the Egyptian collection in University College, London. Fol. 73 pl. and text (Brit. Sch. of Archaeology in Egypt). *Constable*, 1917. 30s. net.

— *Tools and Weapons.* Illus. by the Egyptian collection in University College, London, &c. Fol. 80 pl. and text (Brit. Sch. of Archaeology in Egypt). *Constable*, 1917. 35s. net.

Plautus. With English trans. by Paul Nixon (in 5 vols.). Vol. 2. 18°. 510 pp. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, 1917. 5s. net; lthr. 6s. 6d. net.

Potter (Murray Anthony). *Four essays.* Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*. 139 pp. 8°. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages.) \$1.25 net.

Pythagoras. *The Golden verses of Pythagoras.* Tr. by Fabre d'Olivet. Done into English by Nayan Louise Redfield. 8°. *Putnam*, 1917. 15s. net.

Sherman (C. Phineas). *Roman Law in the Modern World.* 3 v. Boston, *Boston Book Co.*, 83 Francis St., Roxbury, 1917. 8°. \$13.

Sturtevant (Edg. Howard). *Linguistic Change. An introduction to the historical study of language.* Chicago, *University of Chicago*. 10 + 185 pp. il. figs. 12°. \$1 net.

Taylor (Alfr. E.) *Plato's Biography of Socrates.* New York, *Oxford University Press*. 40 pp. 8°. (British Academy pubs.) pap. \$1.

FRENCH.

Alaux. *Les Leçons d'espagnol. (Cours supérieur.)* 4 parts in 1 volume. *Garnier*, 1917. 3 fr. 60.

Amato (Modesto). *Ce que le manifeste de la Pléiade doit à l'Italie.* Palermo, *A. Trimarchi*, 1917. 95 pp.

— *La grammaire de Montaigne.* Palermo, *Trimarchi*, 1917. 82 pp.

Bloch (Oscar). *Les Parlers des Vosges méridionales (arrondissement de Remiremont).* Étude de dialectologie. 290 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 12 fr.

— *Lexique français-patois des Vosges méridionales.* 186 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 27 fr.

Brunot (F.). *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900.* Tome V. *Le Français en France et hors la France au XVII^e siècle.* VIII + 444 pp. *Colin*, 1917. 15 fr.

Delcourt (René). *Expressions d'argot allemand et autrichien dans les tranchées.* *E. de Boccard*, 1917. 4 fr. 80.

Klionoff (Olga). *Correspondance commerciale et mondaine russe à l'usage des Français* (L. Rodstein), 1917. 6 fr. 60.

Lourtau (P.). *Curso de español comercial; prologo de A. Abenza.* 320 pp. *Colin*, 1917. boards. 3 fr. 60.

Maspéro (Gaston). *Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne.* 138 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 18 fr.

Parrel (G. de). *Précis d'anacousie vocale et de labiologie. Méthode orale d'éducation auditive, d'initiation phonétique et de lecture sur les lèvres.* *Maloine*, 1917. 12 fr.

Pernot (Hubert). *Grammaire de grec moderne, langue parlée.* *Garnier*, 1917. boards. 6 fr.

Schweitzer et Simonnot. *La Méthodologie des langues vivantes.* *Colin*, 1917. 4 fr.

Tanquerey (F. J.) L'Évolution du verbe anglo-français, XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. (22nd fascicle of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.) *Champion*, 1917. 870 pp. 30 fr.

Vocabulaire bulgare-français. *Garner*, 1917. 456 pp. boards, 2 fr. 40.

ITALIAN.

Dati (Carlo). Le Origini italiane del Menagio e l'Etimologico toscano degli Accademici della Crusca; undici lettere inedite ad Alessandro Segni (1665-1666) per Ferdinando Massai. (Extracted from Rivista delle biblioteche e degli archivi.) Firenze, tip. E. Ariani, 1917. 22 pp.

D'Ovidio (Francesco). Del sostantivo *stipa* in Dante e d'una ignota forma congiuntivale del bolognese antico. (Extracted from Atti della r. accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti.) Napoli, tip. Cimmaruta, 1917. 23 pp.

Lacalendola (Adamo). Frasi militari usuali, seguite da 1400 vocaboli scelti, usatissimi nella conversazione e nei giornali albanesi moderni: avviamento allo studio dell'albanese toscano usato nell'Albania meridionale, ad uso degli studenti del r. istituto superiore di studi commerciali in Bari. Tip. F. Casini e figlio, 1917. 32 pp.

Lovera (Romeo). Grammatica della lingua romena, coll'aggiunta di modelli di lettere e di un vocabolario delle voci più usuali. Terza edizione corretta ed ampliata. Milano, U. Hoepli, 1917. 211 pp. bound Lire 2.50.

Scherillo (Michele). L'opera buffa napoletana durante il settecento. Palermo, Sandron, 1917. Lire 7.

SPANISH.

Dos romances anónimos del siglo XVI. El sueño de Feliciano de Silva. La muerte de Héctor. Publicados con una introducción y con sus fuentes. H. Thomas. 1 vol. 1917. 86 págs. Pes. 2.

Enciclopedia Universal ilustrada europeo-americana. Etimologías sánscrito, hebreo, griego, latín, árabe, lenguas indígenas americanas, etc. tomo XXXIV. Med.-M'dcz; 1 vil. de 1512 págs. con grabados. tela. Pes. 28.50.

Masriera Colomer (Arturo). Diccionario de Diccionarios castellano, latino, portugués, francés, italiano, catalán, inglés y alemán. Comprensivo del léxico castellano considerablemente aumentado, con su correspondencia en cada uno de los siete idiomas mencionados, y de un vocabulario-resumen de todas las voces extranjeras contenidas en el Diccionario, seguidas de su significación castellana. 4 vols. tela. Pes. 86.

Miranda Podadera (Luis). Tratado de ortografía, acentuación y análisis sintáctico. 42 páginas. Pes. 1.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. Proceedings. Vol. XXXIX. Parts 6 and 7. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Bloomfield (Leonard). Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis. Urbana, Published by the University of Illinois, 1917. Part I: Texts and translation. \$1.50. Part II: Grammatical analysis. \$3. Part III: List of formations and glossary. \$1.50. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. III, Nos. 2, 3 and 4.)

Carnahan (David Hobart). The Ad Deum Vedit of Jean Gerson. Urbana, Published by the University of Illinois, 1917. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. III, No. 1.) \$1.75.

Carpenter (Rhys). The Ethics of Euripides. (Archives of Philosophy, No. 7, May, 1916.) New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1916.

Cooper (John M.) Analytical and critical bibliography of the tribes of Tierra del Fuego and adjacent territory. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 63.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1917.

Cory (H. E.) Edmund Spenser. A Critical Study. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology. Vol. 5, pp. 1-478.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1917.

Jewish Quarterly Review, The. New series. Vol. VIII. No. 3, January, 1918. Philadelphia, Pa., published quarterly by the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1918.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 35, part IV. December, 1917. New Haven, Conn., *The American Oriental Society*, 1917.

Literature. Vol. III. No. 3 and 4. (August and November, 1917.)

Lofberg (John Oscar). Sycophancy in Athens. (University of Chicago diss.) Chicago, Ill., 1917.

Lucretius. Edited by William A. Merrill. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1917. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 4.)

McLemore (James S.) The tradition of the Latin accent. (University of Virginia diss.) *University of Virginia*, 1917.

Meyer (Kuno). Miscellanea Hibernica. Urbana, Published by the University of Illinois, 1917. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. II, No. 4.) \$1.

More (Paul Elmer). Platonism. *Princeton University Press*, 1917. \$1.75.

Mustard (Wilfred P.) The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Ioannes Arnolletus. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918.

Nutting (H. C.) Caesar's Use of Past Tenses in Cum-Clauses. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-53, Feb. 9, 1918.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*.

Palmer (Walter H.) Anaphora: Its Origin and Use. Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Vol. 5. Humanistic Series, No. 1, 1917.

Palmgren (F.) Studier och utkast till fransk ljud- och uttalslära. Vänersborg, *Vänersborgs Boktryckeri*, 1916.

Quarter-Centennial Publications (The) of the University of Chicago. Publications of the Members of the University, 1902-1916. Chicago, Ill., *University of Chicago Press*, 1917.

Radin (Max). Roman Knowledge of Jewish Literature. Classical Journal XIII 3, December, 1917.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXV. Núm 2. Septiembre y Octubre de 1917.

Schoff (Wilfred H.) The Eastern Iron Trade of the Roman Empire. (Reprinted from the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 35, Part III, December, 1915.)

Shakespeare. Yale Edition. The Tragedy of Othello. Ed. by Lawrence Mason. 50 c. The Winter's Tale. Ed. by Frederick E. Pierce. 50 c. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1917.

Smith (Kirby Flower). Martial, the Epigrammatist. Reprinted from *The Sewanee Review*, Janunary, 1918.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XIII, No. 1. January, 1916. *University of North Carolina*, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Vanoverbergh (Morice). A grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco. (Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology Publications, Vol. V, Part VI.) Manila, *Bureau of Printing*, 1917.

Wilkins (Eliza Gregory). "Know Thyself" in Greek and Latin Literature. (University of Chicago diss.) Chicago, Ill., 1917.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX, 2.

WHOLE No. 154

I.—SYNCRETISM IN THE INDO-EUROPEAN DATIVE.

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXIX 26.]

IV. A particularly important branch of the dative of advantage or disadvantage is that dative which was called by Havers, *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der idg. Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1911, *Dativus sympatheticus*, for which a possessive genitive can be substituted. A very large proportion of these datives go back to the primitive dative, i. e. are merely the secondary objects of verbs,¹ and were intelligible even when the dative was not formally characterized. Cf. e. g. Skt. RV. I. 118. 7 *káñvāyāpi riptāya cákṣuh práty adhattam* ‘for the blinded Kanva you put in his eyes again’, Av. Yt. 10. 87 *ahmāi frasčindayeiti nmānəm* ‘for him he destroys (his) house’, Gr. Z 51 τῷ δ’ ἄρα θυμὸν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔπειθε ‘for him he persuaded (his) mind in (his) breast’, κ 440 τῷ οἱ ἀπομῆξας κεφαλὴν . . . καὶ πηῷ περ ἐόντι μάλα σχεδόν ‘with this cutting off for him (his) head, even though he was a very close relative’, Lat. Plaut. Most. I. 3. 62 *ut veneficae illi fauces prehendam* ‘that I might seize for that sorceress (her) throat’ i. e. ‘seize her by the throat’, ib. III *linteum cape atque exterge tibi manus* ‘take a towel and wipe for yourself (your) hands’ Goth. Joh. II. 37 *sa izei uslauk augðna þamma blindin* ‘he who opened (his) eyes for the blind man’, O. H. G. Ot. 4 II. 50

¹ Sometimes also in closer connection with the verb. Thus the examples of the dative with verbs meaning ‘to take away, deprive’ (p. 16) could be considered as belonging to this type.

thaz ein andremo fuazi wasge gerno ‘that one gladly wash the feet for (of) the other’, Lith. Jurk. 12 *tù princēsei ir kēdei sulástei* = Germ. ‘du hast der Prinzessin auch den Rock begossen’, ib. 16 *jey kàs tām smākui gálwq nükert* ‘if any one cuts off the head for this dragon (this dragon’s head)’.

V. *The Ethical Dative.* The remoter interest in a statement of which this use of the dative is indicative may also be suggested in an uninflected form when put alongside of a primary object, as is shown by Fielding’s “they drank me two bottles.” Consequently the following examples of the ethical dative with a direct object belong to the most primitive strata of the uses of the dative: Av. Y. 45. 5 *yōi moi ahmāi¹ səraošam dqn* ‘those who give him their obedience (lit. for me)’, Yt. 17. 59 *imač mē stāvištəm šyaobnəm mašya vərəzinti* ‘das ist mir die gröbste Tat, welche Menschen verüben’, Gr. Ar. Nub. 111 *τοι μαθησομαι*; ‘what shall I learn for you?’, Dem. 18. 178 *τούτῳ πάντα μοι πρόσσχετε τὸν νοῦν* ‘closely give your attention to this for me’, Lat. Hor. Ep. 1. 3. 15 *quid mihi Celsus agit?* ‘what is Celsus doing, I pray?’ (lit. ‘for me’), Cic. Cat. 2. 5 10 *qui mihi accubantes in conviviis . . . eructant sermonibus suis caedem* ‘who (lit. for me) while they are reclining at their banquets, belch forth murder in their talk’, O. H. G. Wess. Pr. *der dir rihtet alla die er kiscuof* ‘who judges (for you) all whom he created’, ib. *die, die dir der almahlige got . . . ladite zi demo ēuuigen libe* ‘those whom the almighty God called (for you) to eternal life’, Lith. Jurk. 23 *kàs mā' nunēss : ēwa pētūs?* ‘who will take for me father’s dinner?’

VI. *The Dative of the Person Judging*, sometimes called “dative of relation.” Usually, however, this occurs with intransitive verbs, so that it looks as though the full development of this construction must be placed after the time when the dative case received its ending. Nevertheless the first beginnings of the same can also be traced to the primitive uninflected dative of the secondary object; for a few passages do occur in which such a dative is used together with a direct object. So in Greek, Aesch. Pr. 12 *σφῶν μὲν ἐντολὴ Διὸς ἔχει*

¹ The use of two datives with an accusative object is a type that also no doubt goes back to the primitive uninflected dative; for the context will make clear the difference between the more closely and the more loosely connected datives just as well as between either of these and the accusative.

$\tau\acute{e}los$ δὴ κοῦδὲν ἐμποδὼν ἔτι 'for you two (i. e. as far as you are concerned) the command of Zeus has fulfilment, and there is no hindrance any longer'. From the Latin cf. Plaut. Tr. 3. 3. 11 *ne . . . te in crimen populo ponat* 'lest it bring you into censure for the people' (i. e. in the eyes of the people).

VII. All of the datives of interest so far quoted were personal datives. For the dative of the person judging and the ethical dative it could of course not be otherwise, and as far as the dative of advantage and disadvantage is concerned, the relation expressed would in the nature of the case be a personal one, at least usually, if not always, not only for the same reason that a dative of the indirect object would usually, though by no means necessarily, be a personal dative (p. 13, 21 f.), but also because the notion of advantage in its truest sense implies a personal object. Nevertheless, some instances can be found which can be brought under the category and are names of things. Usually this is because persons are somehow associated with the thing, either because the word denoting a thing is used figuratively, or because the advantage will be for the persons associated with the thing. Such cases are β 186 σῷ οἴκῳ δῶρον ποτιθέμενος 'receiving a gift for your house', where the gift is for the advantage of the master of the house,¹ and Thuc. I. 11 τὸ γὰρ ἔρυμα τῷ στρατού δῷ οὐκ ἀνέτειχίσαντο 'for else they would not have built the wall for their camp', where the advantage of those who used the camp is in the background. Equally clear is Lat. *privata odia publicis utilitatibus remittere* 'to give up one's private enmity for the sake of the public welfare' (Tac.), and Umbr. *tote Ioueine* 'for the Iguvinian state' in the example quoted on p. 25. The Latin example, however, shows how close such a dative may be to a dative of purpose, and it is merely a matter of nomenclature to which category we assign it. The difference, in fact, is one which is due to the context only, and not one inherent in the case meaning.

3. The Dative of Purpose.

Sometimes the dative of purpose is a concrete idea, and then, as has been pointed out, it is almost undistinguishable from the dative of advantage. It is called a dative of purpose

¹ So Brugmann, Gr. Gr^o. 400.

when the context makes it clear that there is the purpose of producing, procuring, etc., the object designated by the noun in the dative.¹ So e. g. among examples in which the dative is used with a primary object: Skt. RV. 5. 41. 17 *iti cin nū praj yai paçumátyai dévāso vánate mártyo vah* 'thus mortals, ye gods, implore you for (i. e. to get) offspring rich in cattle', AB. 4. 32. 7 *aṅgiraso vai svargāya lokāya sattram āsata* 'the Angirasas held a sacrifice for heaven' i. e. 'to get to heaven', MS. 2. 1. 5 (6. 20) *çvetā gā tājyāya duhanti* 'they milk the white cows for butter' i. e. 'to get butter', Gr. Δ 486 δῆρα ἵππον κάμψη περικαλλέν δίφρῳ² 'that he might bend the felloe for (i. e. to make) a beautiful chariot', Lat. Caes. B. G. 7. 16 *locum castris deligit* 'he selects a site for a camp', Verg. Aen. 3. 109 *optavitque locum regno* 'and chose a place for a kingdom', Liv. 1. 12. 4 *hic in Palatio prima urbi fundamenta ieci* 'here on the Palatine hill I laid the first foundations for a city'.

More frequently the dative of purpose is an abstract noun, and a very large proportion of these are used together with primary objects either of the person or thing, and therefore represent a type that goes back to the primitive uninflected dative. The notion of purpose is here a mere variety of the suggestions brought in by the other secondary objects. When an abstract noun is used after a verb together with a concrete noun of the person or thing, it is evident that the abstraction cannot in any real sense be affected by the verb like a concrete idea, since it has no real existence apart from the concrete ideas with which it is connected, and consequently in such a combination the abstract word will be felt as a kind of secondary or indirect object, and suggest a relation which we describe by saying that the dative designates the intention of attaining a purpose.³ We can still say in English "send help" as well as "send an army," but the primitive language could combine the two as though: "send army help,"⁴ in which case the

¹ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2². 559.

² Though the dative of purpose is not recognized for the Greek, it is evident that the example here given does not in any way differ from concrete datives of purpose of the other languages. [Cf. Meisterh., p. 209, §§ 25-27.—C. W. E. M.]

³ So Schmalz, op. cit. 377.

⁴ Such a collocation, however, would be unambiguous only as long as 'help' is strictly abstract. Just as soon as it may mean bodies of

latter would be the *relatively* less affected object and be indirect, i. e. would be 'to help', and would suggest the notion of purpose.

Though the large category of infinitives of purpose would historically belong to this category,¹ I confine the examples to living abstract nouns: Skt. RV. 5. 51. 12 *svariáye vāyúm úpa bravāmahai* 'we will call upon Vāyu for welfare', CB. 1. 2. 3. 1 *agnim hoitrāya prāvṛṇata* 'they elected Agni for the priesthood', RV. 6. 63. 5 *ádhi c̄riyé duhitā s̄t̄ryasya rātham tas-thau* 'the daughter of the sun mounts the chariot for beauty' i. e. 'so that it is beautiful', Av. Y. 9. 27 *amāča ḡwā varəθraynāča māvōya upamruye tanuye* 'for power and victory I pray (to) thee for my person', Y. 46. 10 *yaqčā haxšāi x̄smavatqm vahmāi a* 'whom I will urge on to your worship', Yt. 10. 26 *yō daišhaom uparāi amāi daðāiti* 'who helps the land to superior strength', Lat. Cato *granatui videto ut satis viciae seras* 'see to it that you sow enough vetch for (the purpose of) gathering in the grains', Caes. B. C. 1. 52 *tertiam aciem . . . nostris subsidio² misit* 'he sent the third line as a relief to our men', Tac. An. 16. 4 *ea quem indutui gerebat veste* 'that dress which he had for putting on', O. Blg. *položilz ny jesí směchu všeřm člověkomz²* 'you have made us for ridicule (i. e. an object of ridicule) for everybody', *otzdati džšterb braku* 'to give the daughter in marriage'.

It thus appears that the primitive dative of the secondary object has a very wide field indeed compared to what would be the "Grundbedeutung" if we assume a purely localistic origin. Wherever mere collocation of two substantives depending on one and the same verb causes one to appear as less intimately affected by the verb than the other, there we have a primitive dative in the former. Thus the main body of the datives of the indirect object with transitive verbs, a con-

troops or supplies for the purpose of helping, it will become the direct object, and the whole will mean 'send help to the army'.

¹ This point was emphasized by Hopkins, JAOS. 28. 406, and Bennett, Synt. of Early Lat. 103, as of importance in judging the validity of the statement that the dative is a personal case.

² The use of two different datives with a direct object is just as easy even in an uninflected state of language when one is a dative of purpose as in case of a collocation like that referred to p. 118 n.

siderable part of those with intransitive verbs, namely when these take an internal object, a large proportion of datives in looser relations to the verb, particularly of the dative of advantage and disadvantage, but also of the ethical dative and dative of the person judging, and finally, a large part of the datives of purpose can all be traced to this uninflected "Urdativ." It only required the development of a special form which would distinguish it from the direct object, and would no longer make its existence dependent on the coexistence of a primary object, and we can see how all of the other historical uses of the dative could easily have developed from this large nucleus.

II. THE LOCATIVAL DATIVE OF THE SINGULAR.

This special form, as far as the dative singular is concerned, must have been originally a case not differing in meaning from the locative singular, since the dative suffix *-aī* is merely the strong form of the locative *-i*. Now the locative case often appears to designate the goal or limit of motion or its direction,¹ not indeed because these notions were attached to the locative case itself, but because the situation will often suggest these ideas even when the case denotes mere place with no reference to motion.² That is why the locative with verbs implying motion may so frequently be used where we should expect an accusative of limit. Cf. e. g. Skt. RV. 1. 77. *I yó mártyesu . . . it kṛṇōti devān* 'who brings the gods to men (loc.)', Gr. v 363 ἀλλὰ χρήματα μὲν μυχῷ ἄντρον . . . θείομεν 'but let us put the treasures *in* a corner of the cave', Lat. Val. Fl. 4. 378 *saxo posuit latus*. In the same way the old local *-aī* forms must have been sometimes synonymous with expressions denoting direction or limit of motion, and when such a case-form, as in the examples quoted from the real locative, was used together with an object, it competed with the primitive uninflected dative of the secondary object, which, as we have seen above, could also often suggest the notion of the direction or goal of motion. Starting from this rather large common sphere of usage, the form in *-aī*, preferred because the clearer, extended its sphere so as to include all of

¹Cf. Delbrueck, Ai. Syntax 121 f., for the Skt.

²So Brugmann, op. cit. 515 A.

the functions of the primitive uninflected dative, and finally took its place. The I. E. dative thus at a very early date had gone through exactly the same process as the dative of the Romance languages, in most of which the accusative with *ad*,¹ purely local in origin, took the place of the Latin dative in all its uses.

The sphere of usage which was common to the primitive dative and the locatival dative singular would, of course, be conceived as being more or less wide according to the localistic predilections of the person judging. I have already referred to the fact that it is logically possible to bring in localistic notions everywhere where the passage concerns objects of sense, and in a large number of others from the figurative point of view. The real question is whether there is any probability that such expressions were conceived locally, and, if possible, whether other indisputably localistic forms of expression like the locative case² or a prepositional phrase are actually competing with the dative. Even here, however, caution is in order. When Gustafsson, op. cit. 64, concludes that because in Latin one could say *subsidio mihi venit* or *ad subsidium mihi venit*, the 'dative of purpose' of the former is to be taken locally, he is shooting far beside the mark, and forgets that prepositional phrases begin to lose their local meaning and become extended to all sorts of figurative uses at a very early time. But however wide or narrow we may draw the line for the use of this local case, it is the same principle, and enough is left to make probable the supposition that syncretism resulted from this common sphere.

With no attempt to demarcate its bounds closely, this common territory would seem to me approximately to consist of the following categories, in all of which, of course, the dative must be accompanied by a primary object: the dative singular after verbs meaning to write, show, stretch out, raise, bring, carry, send, throw, hurl' (p. 18 ff.), occasionally those meaning 'to give, offer, sell, lend, owe' (p. 14 ff.), and very rarely no

¹ The process, in fact, was almost completed in the Vulgar Latin stage: cf. Grandgent, Intr. to Vulg. Lat., p. 44 f.

² The competition of the Accusative of Limit with the Dative is particularly emphasized by Professor Hopkins in his article "The Vedic Dative Reconsidered," TAPA. 37. 87 ff., repeatedly referred to above.

doubt even those meaning ‘to say, command, promise, prophesy, answer, to complain of, sing’ (p. 17 f.). However, in the last group the local notion could only have been figurative, and therefore exceptional. Then again some cases of the “*dativus sympatheticus*” can be conceived locally, e. g. Skt. *kāñvāya cákṣuh práty adhattam* either ‘for Kanya’ or ‘on Kanya you put in the (his) eyes again’. On the other hand, the dative of advantage or disadvantage in most of its forms, the ethical dative and dative of the person judging, and the dative of purpose cannot ordinarily be brought into the category of local datives without violence, even though sporadic instances might occur in which we could allow its possibility, e. g. for the dative of purpose of concretes Lat. *prima urbi fundamenta ieci*, or of abstracts Skt. RV. 6. 45. 7 *sákhāyam . . . gām ná doháse nuve* ‘I call the friend like a cow to the milking’ or ‘for milking’.

On the other hand, this locatival dative singular could be used in many instances where the primitive dative would be impossible. Here we must leave out of account the strictly locatival uses which are not found in any datives. We can argue that if the dative singular was merely an ablaut-variant of the locative, there should also be no difference of meaning, but as a matter of fact the local uses of the dative are all of the directive or possibly terminative kind, so that a differentiation must have taken place.¹ Whether this occurred before or after the form in *-aī* came in contact with the primitive dative, the result remains the same. If the latter, the primitive dative, which could in certain environments suggest a local idea of the directive or terminative kind only, but not of place where, in turn influenced the sphere of usage of the form in *-aī* at the very beginning. The uses of this locatival dative singular which it brought in to the later dative are therefore

¹ I am inclined to believe that the use of the dative adverb Gr. *χα-μαλ* Lat. *humi* in the meaning ‘on the ground’ (Brugmann, op. cit. 703 quotes Homeric *rōv aš χαμαλ ἐκερδίκει* ‘he killed him upon the ground’ and from Cicero *nihil interest, humine an sublime putescat*) instead of ‘toward the ground’ is a petrified remnant from the time before syncretism with the primitive case of the secondary object, rather than that it was due to subsequent influence of similar locative forms, as Brugmann, loc. cit.

those directive and terminative uses of the same which can not be traced to the primitive dative of the secondary object.

In the first place, even though the primitive dative could sometimes be non-personal and even be a place name (p. 22 f.), yet the fact that the notion of direction thus suggested would be much clearer in an inflected dative, suggests the conclusion that the development of the construction came from the form in *-ač*, which is therefore responsible for the majority, though not all, of the constructions like Skt. RV. 10. 9. 3 *yásya kṣáyāya jinvatha čpo janáyathā ca naḥ* 'to whose house, O waters, ye hurry (us) and cause us to come', Gr. A 3 ψυχὰς Αἰδί προλαύψεν 'sent the souls to Hades' (unless the latter is still conceived as the god rather than the place),¹ Pind. I. 6. 41 ὁ δ' ἀντεῖναις οὐπανῷ χεῖπας 'but he stretching out toward heaven his hands', Lat. Verg. Aen. 12. 130 *defigunt telluri hastas* 'fix the spears into the ground', ib. 5. 233 *palmas ponto tendens* 'stretching his hands toward the sea', ib. 2. 553 *lateri . . . abdidit ensem* 'buried (his) sword in (his) side', Val. Fl. 5. 9 *robora portant arae* 'carry wood to the altar', Serb. *vode njega*² *dvoru bijelome* 'lead him to the white house'.

Secondly, the fact that this case was by its ending differentiated from the direct object, allowed the use of such combinations as 'send one to death' instead of the simpler and more obvious 'send death to one', which alone was possible for the uninflected dative. So e. g. Skt. RV. 8. 22. 7 *trksim . . . mahé kṣatrāya jinvathah* 'urged Trkshi to great power', ib. 8. 43. 19 *agnim . . . admasádyāya hinivire* 'urged Agni to commensality', ib. 6. 44. II *mā jásvane . . . no rarithah* 'do not give us to misery', ib. 1. 189. I *ágne náya . . . rāyé asmán* 'Agni, lead us toward wealth', ib. 3. 8. II *yám . . . prañināya mahaté saúbhagāya* 'whom it leads toward great bliss', Lat. Plaut. Capt. 3. 5. 34 *te morti misero* 'shall have sent you to death', id. Merc. 2. 4. 4 *ibi me toxicō morti dabo* 'there with poison I shall give myself unto death', Verg. Aen. 12. 513 *neci . . . tris uno congressu . . . mittit* 'sends to death three with one

¹ A similar ambiguous case is Verg. Aen. 2 398 *multos Danaum demittimus Orco* 'we sent many of the Greeks to Orcus' (or 'the lower world').

² The Slavic genitive is used as direct object in place of the accusative of words designating living beings. Cf. e. g. Leskien, Handb. d. ab. Spr. 61. However, this does not affect the nature of the dative.

assault'. In all of these passages the local force of the dative seems distinct enough even though figurative.

More important, however, is the ability of this locatival dative to designate direction, or, eventually, goal of the motion, independently of the existence of a primary object, i. e. it can as well be used as the only object with intransitive and passive verbs or with transitive verbs used absolutely. The most clearly localistic of these uses, in fact of all uses of the dative, is the dative after verbs meaning 'to come, go', and the like, particularly those of words designating a place. So e. g. Skt. RV. 8. 44. 25 *samudrāyeva sindhavah* . . . *irate* 'rush as rivers toward the sea', ib. 9. 9. 2 *prā-pra kṣayāya pānyase* . . . *arṣa* 'auf, ströme zum berühmten Sitz', *çakatāyābhīpravrajati* 'steps forward to the wagon', Raghuv. 12. 7 *vanāya gaccha* 'go into the forest',¹ Gr. Eur. Herc. Fur. 242 ἐπειδὴν δὲ εἰσομαθῶσιν πόλεις² 'when they will have been taken to the city', Lat. Verg. Aen. 5. 451 *it clamor caelo* 'clamor rises toward heaven', id. Georg. I. 401 *nebulae . . . campo recumbunt* 'fogs settle upon the plain', O. Eng. *pá he heofonun ástág* 'there-upon he ascended to heaven', O. Blg. *šedzši domovi* 'going to her home', Serv. *več ti idi dvoru bijelomu* 'but you go to the white farm'. The same category with personal datives e. g. Skt. RV. 1. 154. 3 *prá viṣṇave çuṣām etu mánma* 'forth unto Vishnu shall go the mighty song', ib. 1. 39. 7 *gántā nunám nō' vasā yáthā purā . . . káñvāya* 'come now to us with help as formerly to Kanya', Av. Y. 49. 1 *gaidī moi* 'come to me', Gr. Γ 121 'Ιπεις . . . Ελένη . . . ἄγγελος ἡλθεν' Iris came to Helen as a messenger', Lat. Enn. An. 450 *undique convenient . . . tela tribuno* 'from everywhere the missiles come upon the tribune',

¹ According to Hopkins, op. cit. 119 f., such strictly terminative uses of the dative were developed from a vague directive force, which in turn was also the source of the interest notion. If the theory of the dative here presented is correct, we cannot distinguish between direction and goal of motion so accurately; for the original use of the local dative singular embraced these as well as other uses, while even the influence of the subsequent syncretism with the case of the indirect object did not rule out the terminative notion any more than the directive: in *dare alicui aliquid* there is no more reason to say that one thinks merely of the direction of the giving than to be certain that one is actually thinking of the limit of motion.

² The passive is here synonymous with an active meaning 'to go'. Cf. p. 133.

O. H. G. *boton quement mīne thir* 'my messengers will come to you', O. Sax. *grurios quāmun im* 'horror came (upon) him', O. Eng. *héo . . . zewát hire hláfordum* 'she went to her lord', O. Blg. *bogovi prichodiši* 'you are coming to God', Serv. *idem ocu svojemu* 'I am going to my father'. When the dative is abstract the local idea is of course purely figurative, and may approach the notion of purpose: Skt. RV. I. 103. 4 *upaprayán dasyuhátyāya* 'coming forward unto demon-slaying', ib. I. 61. 14 *sadyó bhuvad vīryāya* 'immediately he came to power', Av. V. 13. 8 *urva parāiti parāsnāi arāuhe* 'the soul goes forth to the future life', Lat. Verg. Aen. 2. 62 *occumbere morti* 'to meet death'.

Of other intransitive verbs with the dative, those meaning 'to approach' and 'to meet' seem most probably to owe their construction to the locatival dative: their dative is a dative of direction, and is almost identical with the dative after 'to come'. Cf. Gr. μ 108 *σκοπέλω πεπλημένος* 'approaching the rock', Ε 438 *πλήρῳ χθονὶ* 'he approached (i. e. sank to) the earth', Plat. Symp. 195 Β *δρούσιν δρούσι ἀν πελάζει* 'like always meets like', Lat. Caes. B. G. 4. 10 *ubi Oceano adpropinquavit* 'where it (the Rhine) approaches the Ocean'. With personal dative e. g. Gr. Z 399 η̄ οῑ ξεντ' η̄ντησε 'she thereupon met him', Soph. Tr. 902 ὅπως . . . ἀντών πατρί 'that he might meet his father', Lat. Cic. Phil. 4. 4 *illi poena, nobis libertas appropinquat*, Goth. Marc. 5. 2 *gamotida¹ imma manna* 'a man met him', O. Sax. Hel. 1701 *it simbla mōtean skal erlō gihwilt-komu sulik, sō he it öðrumu gedōd* 'it shall always befall each man as he does to others', O. H. G. Ot. 3. 2. 3 *fuar ingegin imo* 'went to meet him'. With an abstract dative e. g. μ 41 ο̄ς τις ἀδρείη πελάσῃ 'whoever come near to folly' i. e. 'whoever be so foolish'.

It is, however, quite possible that these datives of the last paragraph are not pure local datives, but are of composite origin. The fact that Gr. *πελάζω* is sometimes transitive and then has a similar dative of the secondary object, e. g. ο 482

¹The synonym *sih nēhan* takes a dative which is a secondary object, since the reflexive pronoun is as truly an object as any other. However, there is the possibility that this reflexive verb took the place of an original middle verb, but this would not affect the psychic attitude of the speaker.

τοὺς δὲ Ἰθάκη ἐπέλασσε . . . ἀνεμος 'the wind brought them (near) to Ithaca', suggests that the dative after the intransitive verbs could have been patterned after those with the transitive verbs after the dative had once been characterized formally. Altogether probable is a similar origin of datives after verbs meaning 'to incline toward, bend down to, to fall to one's share, become one's own', etc., although all of these and some others may be logically forced into the category of datives of direction, and may have been occasionally associated with other unquestionable local datives.

On the other hand the locatival dative, in contrast to the uninflected primitive dative, could from the beginning be attached to substantives and adjectives of meaning kindred with that of the verbs which took the case as well as to the verbs themselves. We thus can refer to it not only indisputably local datives with substantives, as in Skt. RV. 10. 99. 8 *kṣayāya gṛtūm vidān no asmē* 'he has found us a way toward home' or Lat. Verg. Aen. 6. 126 *facilis descensus Averno* 'easy is the descent to Avernus', but also the datives with substantives which are associated with verbs which could take the primitive case of the secondary object, if the same relation can be viewed locally (p. 23). So e. g. Av. Y. 27. 13 *varəhəuš dazdā manarəhō šyaoθanānqm arəhəuš mazdai* 'the bringer to Mazda of the works of life of the good disposition', Lat. Cic. Top. 5. 28 *traditio alteri* 'a delivering up to another', Umbr. II a 8 *tikamne Juvie* 'with a dedication to Jovius'.

Under the same conditions as with substantives, adjectives which are associated with verbs should be able to take local datives, but since these are usually participles, i. e. are so intimately associated with the verb that they become a part of the verbal system, they call for no special comment, unless it be adjectives meaning 'near', the dative with which would be purely local if the same is true of the corresponding verbs meaning 'to approach, meet', etc. Cf. e. g. Gr. Soph. Ant. 761 *πλησία τῷ νυμφίῳ* 'near to the bride-groom', Lat. Hor. S. I. 5. 45 *proxima Campano ponti . . . villula* 'a little villa closest to the Campanian bridge'.

All in all the importance of the locatival dative singular consists not so much in the number of actual occurrences of

the dative which can with probability be traced to it—on the contrary, the real local datives are quite rare, and of such a nature that they are not too far from uses that can be developed from the dative of the secondary object. Its real importance lies herein, that by giving the dative of the secondary object a formal distinction, the latter was no longer dependent on the coexistence of a primary object, so that it could be extended to constructions with intransitive verbs and substantives and adjectives. And as patterns for these extensions the locatival dative was itself occasionally construed in these ways, so as to make the same much easier also for non-local constructions. However, for the full development of these possibilities there was necessary a formally characterized dative plural as well as singular.

III. THE ABLATIVAL DATIVE PLURAL.

Our conception of the way in which syncretism took place between the uninflected dative of the secondary object in the plural and the dative-ablative in *-bhjōs*, *-bhos*, and *-mos*, will depend on how we interpret these forms. If, like Professor Hopkins, op. cit. p. 119, we believe them to have been originally place-designating forms which did not differentiate between motion to and from and rest, then the dative-ablative plural was in one field of usage exactly parallel to the locatival dative singular, and its influence on the historical dative would be completely analogous, so that we should merely quote plural examples parallel to the singular ones of the last chapter to show how much the historical dative owes to it. However, to this point of view there are two objections. I have already referred to the fact that all of these endings end in *-os*, and that this makes it highly probable that these forms were made under the influence of the genitive-ablative singular, which did not have the function of either the dative or accusative. Furthermore, if the dative plural were indifferently local in origin, we should expect that it would show as many traces of real directive and terminative force as the dative singular. But Pischel, BB. I. 113, remarks that all of the examples of datives with pure terminative meaning in Sanskrit are singulars, and a glance over the best Latin examples given by Landgraf, ALL. 8. 70 ff., reveals the fact that the local dative plural, while not unknown, is very much rarer than the singu-

lar in Latin also. This is much more easily explained by assuming that the dative plural was of ablative origin and that consequently directive and terminative uses were at first foreign to it, than by the idea that there would be a tendency later to confine these uses to the singular. Accepting, however, the theory that the dative-ablative plural was at first only an ablative, and took the place of the primitive dative by syncretism, it follows that we must seek as a starting-point a common sphere of usage for the dative and ablative plural, and this can only be the so-called dative of separation, i. e. the dative with verbs meaning 'to take away, deprive', etc., which, though a dative of the secondary object¹ in origin, suggested the notion of separation by the context, so that an ablative would have been equally in place. Aside from examples already mentioned, p. 16, the following might be quoted as occupying this common ground: Skt. RV. 1. 97. 1 *āpa nah
gōcucad aghám* 'shining away guilt for us', RV. 10. 48. 2 *ahám dásyubhyāḥ*² *pári nr̄mṇām t̄ dade* 'I took away for (or from) the demons their manliness', ib. 10. 39. 4 *nīṣ taugryám
ūhathur adbhyāḥ* '(aus) den Wassern habt ihr den Taugrya entzogen', Av. V. 3. 39 *aētāčīt aēibyō sp̄ār̄haiti* 'auch diese (Sünden) nimmt sie (von) ihnen weg', Y. 9. 28 *gəurvaya hē
pādave zāvara* 'nimm (von) seinen Füssen die Kraft', Gr. A 456 Δαναοῖσιν ἀεκέα λοιγὸν ἀμυνον 'ward off for the Greeks unseemly ruin', Xen. Cyr. 4. 2. 10 μέγαν αὐτοῖς φόβον ἀπεληλάκειν ἐδόκει 'he seemed to have removed for them a great fright', Lat. Cic. Cat. M. 71 vitam adulescentibus vis aufert 'violence deprives young men (of) life', Sall. Cat. 12. 5 *omnia
sociis adimere* 'took everything (from) the allies', Verg. Aen. 8. 254 *prospectum eripiens oculis* 'taking away the view for (or from) the eyes', O. H. G. *thaz sie mih in irrelitin* 'that they might save me (from) them', O. Sax. Hel. 5449 *that hie*

¹ It is indifferent whether we call this secondary object a dative of the indirect object or of advantage and disadvantage.

² This and the two following examples are usually considered ablatives, but there is no way of deciding in the individual case, and it is in fact the very ambiguity of such forms that is so important from our point of view. That the 'dative of separation' is actually found in Skt. is shown not only by the first example, where *nah* cannot possibly be an ablative, but also by singular datives, which are always unambiguous, e. g. RV. 2. 30. 2, according to Hopkins, op. cit. 113.

im skoldi thia giwald biniman ‘that he should take (from) them their power’, O. Eng. *wrāpum sceal stefne minre forstolen hreddan* ‘for (i. e. from) the enemy I shall take away by means of my voice what has been stolen’.

Starting with this common sphere of usage, the original ablative plural became also the dative plural¹ by the same process of syncretism by which the locatival dative singular became *the* dative: the inflected form, as being the clearer, was substituted everywhere for the old uninflected dative; and after the dative thus received an ending in the plural also, it could, like the singular, be used as well with intransitive verbs and substantives and adjectives, since it was no longer dependent on the coexistence of the primary object of a verb. After the plural forms had thus received a sphere of usage somewhat like the singular in *-ai*, the natural result was that the two numbers in turn became associated with each other, so that there resulted complete identity of uses, in as far as these were not conditioned on number. Only after this stage was reached, can one with propriety speak of the uses of *the* dative.

IV. DATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF COMPOSITE ORIGIN.

It now remains only to indicate in the most general way how the remaining historic uses of the dative are derived from those already discussed by the working together of two forces: the force of analogy to either the non-localistic uses of the primitive dative of the secondary object, or (more rarely) the localistic uses, and the existence of inflectional endings of local origin. I adopt a classification parallel to the one used for the primitive dative.

1. *The Dative as Sole Object in Closer Connection with the Verb.*

I. *With normally transitive verbs.* I am not referring to the numerous instances in which a dative is the secondary object with either a genitive or infinitive or clause as primary object instead of an accusative, as e. g. Skt. *agnir iṣṭāṁ sakhyē dadātu nah* ‘may Agni give us (of the) refreshments in friendship’, Lith. *dūk mán pēno* ‘give me (some) milk’ with a genitive;

¹ Cf. Brugmann, op. cit. 504 ff., for the syncretism of ablative and dative in Germanic, largely because of a similar common sphere of usage.

or Gr. β 6 *κηρύκεσσι . . . κέλευσε κηρύσσειν* 'ordered the heralds to summon', Lat. Ter. Eun. 2. 2. 21 *imperavi egomet mihi omnia adsentari* 'I have ordered myself to assent to everything' with an infinitive; or verbs of saying and speaking with a substantive clause, e. g. Skt. RV. 7. 87. 4 *uvāca me várunah* 'Varuna declared to me' (with words following), Lat. Plaut. As. 5. 2. 88 *dicebam, pater, tibi ne matri consuleres male* 'I told you, father, that etc.' In all such combinations the dative is as truly a secondary object as when used with an accusative, and just as little depended on inflectional endings for its interpretation.

There are, however, cases where a transitive verb takes a dative with no coexisting direct object of any kind, either because it is suggested by the context or situation or because it is of such a general nature that no reference to it is needed. So e. g. Skt. RV. 9. 82. 4 *çrnuhi brávimi te* 'listen, I speak to thee' (with no quotation), Osc. Herentateí Herukinai prúffed 'Veneri Erycinæ posuit' (i. e. the marble table on which the dedication was inscribed); also such phrases as Engl. *to give to the poor* or Germ. *den Armen geben, den Göttern opfern*, exactly like Gr. *ρέζειν θεῷ* (e. g. B 400) after phrases like *ékarómbas rézειν θεῷ* 'to sacrifice hecatombs to the god' (e. g. Ψ 206). In these instances the habit of using the dative to whom, as contracted in the usual transitive uses of the verb, simply exerted its force when the object was omitted, unless indeed there was actually in the mind an unexpressed direct object, in which case the dative was still a dative of the secondary object.

The same habit of using the dative of the indirect object with transitive verbs accounts for retaining the dative of the person when the construction becomes passive, e. g. Skt. RV 3. 62. 7 *susṭutir . . . túbhyam çasyate* 'the song is sung to thee' Gr. E 428 *οὐ τοι . . . δέδοται πολεμῆτα ἔργα* 'to you deeds of war are not given', Lat. Plaut. Am. prol. 138 *ea dona quae illuc Amphitruoni sunt data* 'those gifts which were there given to Amphitruo'.

II. *With normally intransitive verbs.* Partially these arose in the same way as the dative as sole object with passives and verbs normally transitive, i. e. those instances in which the dative was a secondary object along with a direct object or cognate

accusative acted as patterns for those in which there was no such primary object. Thus in Latin *mihi ignoscas* (Cic. Att. 7. 12. 3) after *mihi hoc ignoscas* (ib. 1. 1. 4), Germ. *vergieb uns* after *vergieb uns unsere Schuld*, or Gr. τῷδε πιστεύω λόγῳ 'I trust this speech' (Soph. El. 886) like λόγοις δ' ἐμοῖσι πίστευσον τάδε 'trust my words these things' i. e. 'herein' (Eur. Hel. 710). Since many verbs considered intransitive may occasionally take a cognate accusative, the field of the influence of combinations of the dative with such internal objects was no doubt much wider than appears on the surface.

Still more important, however, in the development of the use of the dative with intransitive verbs was the force of the analogy of synonymous expressions in which the dative was a dative of the secondary object,¹ or was used with passive verbs. We might illustrate in English by the use of the preposition *to* in *listen to* after *give ear to*, *attend to* after *give attention to*, *to fall to (one's lot)* after *to be given to*.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that the locatival dative was from the beginning used with intransitive verbs like those meaning 'to come, go' just as well as with transitive verbs, and that these were therefore themselves patterns for other verbs which might be associated with them, even if these were not themselves of such meaning as to take a local dative. Verbs meaning 'to approach' could very well have been among the patterns for those meaning 'to incline toward, bend, make obeisance'.²

There follows a list of important categories of intransitive verbs with the dative which are common to several I. E. languages, together with suggested associations which may be responsible for their constructions: verbs meaning *to help*,

¹ The equivalence of certain intransitive verbs with combinations of transitive verbs and their objects or of verbs and predicate nouns was stressed by H. C. Nutting, CJ. 2. 250, and Fay, loc. cit. 193.

² The best examples of the influence of passives on intransitives are verbs meaning 'to appear': Skt. RV. अवृ एभ्यो अभावत् स्त्र्यः 'the sun became manifest to them', Gr. ο 516 οὐ μὲν γέρ τι θαμὰ μητσιῆροις . . . φαίνεται 'for she does not often appear to the suitors', Lat. Tib. 4. 1. 65 quis numquam . . . dies apparuit 'to whom day never appears'. This identity of 'to appear' and 'to be shown' is seen particularly from the Gr. φαίνεται, which, though classified as a passive, can oftener be translated 'appear' than 'be shown'.

e. g. Skt. *çak-*, Gr. ἀρίγω, *χραισμέω*, *βοηθέω*, Lat. *auxilior*, O. H. G. *helpan* O. Icel. *hialpa*, Lith. *padéti*, O. Blg. *pomošti*; after expressions meaning 'to bring or give help to', like Gr. ἀρίγειν τοῖς after e. g. Aesch. Cho. 476 πέμπετ' ἀρωγὴν παισὶν send help to the children', Lat. *auxilior alicui* after e. g. Enn. ap. Cic. Ac. 2. 28. 89 *fer mi auxilium. to serve*, e. g. Skt. *çam-*, Av. *vid-*, Gr. *ὑπηρετέω*, Lat. *servio*,¹ Goth. *andbahtjan* O. H. G. *ambachten*, O. H. G. *thionon* O. Icel. *pióna*, O. Blg. *služiti*; either by analogy to 'to help', or after expressions like Germ. *einem einen Dienst erweisen*, Gr. CIG. 1125 ἄλλας ὑπηρεσίας ἴστοράντα τῷ πόλει 'undertaking other services for the city', Lat. Plaut. Capt. 2. 3. 31 *servitutem servire huic homini. to pardon, forgive*; see p. 132 f. *to wish well* (Lat. *bene volo*, Av. *urvāz-*) and *to wish ill* (Lat. *male volo*); the Germ. *einem etwas Gutes* (or *Böses*) *wünschen* suggests that the Latin abverbial verb phrases also go back to *bonum* (or *malum*) *alicui velle*, and thus were originally datives of the secondary object, while the Avestan word was no doubt formed by analogy to similar phrases. *to be angry at*, e. g. Skt. *har-*, *krudh-*, Gr. *χολόομαι*, *κοτέω*, *ὅργιζομαι*, Lat. *irascor*, Goth. *hatizōn*; after phrases like Gr. Θ 449 *τοῖσιν κότον αἰνὸν ἔθεσθε* 'against whom you have conceived a terrible wrath'. *to envy*, e. g. Skt. *sparh-*, Gr. *φθονέω*, Lat. *invideo*, Lith. *pavydēti*, O. Blg. *zavidēti*; probably after the transitive use of the same or similar verbs, cf. p. 16. *to please*, e. g. Skt. *svad-* (of taste), *chand-*, Gr. *ἀνδάνω*, *ἀρέσκω*, Lat. *placeo*: possibly after expressions like Eng. *it gives me great pleasure* or Germ. *es macht mir viel Vergnügen*, as is suggested by Gr. Pher. Chir. 1. 1 *σοὶ τε γὰρ κλύειν | ἐμοὶ τε λέξαι μῦθον ἡδονὴν ἔχει* 'for it gives you pleasure to hear and me to tell my story':² *to believe*, e. g. Skt. *çrad-dhā-* = Lat. *credo*, Gr. *πιστεύω*, Goth. *galaubjan* O. H. G. *gilouben*, Lith. *vėryti*, O. Blg. *věrovati*; as was pointed out again by Fay, CQ. 5. 193, the dative with *credo* is explained by Skt. RV. 2. 12. 5 *çrád asmai dhatta* 'put belief in him', i. e. 'believe him', as originally a dative of the

¹The dative after 'to serve' may also come from 'be servant to', see p. 138.

²However, cf. Her. 7. 160 *εἰ δὲ ὑμῖν ἡδονὴ τοῦ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἥγεμονεύειν*, which suggests that the dative after 'to please' might have been influenced by 'it is a pleasure to'.

secondary object, though in both Sanskrit and Latin the origin was forgotten.¹ The dative with the other words meaning 'to believe' either by analogy to these very words (if they existed in the respective languages) or to others like them, though the transitive use (p. 21) of some of these words also had its influence. Sometimes identical, like Skt. *çrad-dhā-* Lat. *credo*, sometimes closely associated with this group are verbs meaning *to trust*, e. g. Gr. *πέποιθα*, Lat. *fido*; Goth. *trauan* O. H. G. *trüen* O. Icel. *trúa*, Lith. *isz-si-tikti*. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the construction of these verbs must have originated exactly like those meaning 'to believe'. *to listen to, give attention to, obey*; e. g. Skt. *gru-*, Gr. *ἱπακούω, πείθομαι*, Lat. *ausculto, oboedio*, Goth. *gaumjan* O. Icel. *geyma* (only 'give attention to'), Goth. *hausjan* O. H. G. *hören*, O. Blg. *vən-imati* (only 'give attention to'); the Latin compound *aus-culto*, literally 'to incline the ear to',² phrases like Av. *yōi ahmāi səraošəm dən* 'who give him obedience', Gr. Ar. Equ. 503 *ἡνῦν προσέχετε τὸν νοῦν* 'give your attention to us', Lat. Ov. M. 3. 692 *praebuimus longis ambagibus aures* 'gave our ears to long circumlocutions', show clearly how these datives originated. Cf. also Shakespeare's *lend me your ears. to approach, meet; see p. 127 f. to incline toward, bend down to*, e. g. Skt. *nam-*, O. H. G. O. Sax. *hnīgan*, Lith. *klōnotis* O. Blg. *pokloniti se*; for origin cf. Skt. RV. 10. 34. 8 *ugrásya cin manyáve nā namante rājā cid ebhyo námā it kr̄noti* 'they do not even bend down before the wrath of a mighty one, (but) even the king makes obeisance to them', where the phrase *námās kar-* with the dative occurs as the synonym of the verb in the very same passage. For the earliest period it is also a question how far combinations of the verb with a reflexive direct object and dative of the secondary object were the patterns for the dative of the middle verbs. *to yield, give way*, e. g. Skt. *ni-hā-*, Av. *upa-dā-*, Gr. *ἄκω, παρέκω, χωρέω παραχωρέω*, Lat. *cedo*, O. H. G. *wichan*. At least three different paths of association lead to the dative with these words: for the Skt. and Av. words in the sense 'to withdraw before i. e. from' there was an association with the

¹ Thus *credo* itself becomes transitive: *istuc tibi credere*, p. 21.

² See Fay, loc. cit.

opposite 'approach, meet',¹ (p. 127 f.), while the derivation from χώρα of Gr. *χωρέω* and παραχωρέω suggests that these took their case after phrases meaning 'to give ground to', as figuratively Plut. 2. 62 D οὐ διδὸς ἐτέρη τόπον οὐδὲ χώραν διακοίας; for the other words the patterns partially were similar locutions, partially the numerous instances in which these same verbs were used with both direct and indirect object, e. g. Gr. Ψ 337 εἰξαί τέ οἱ ἵπια lit. 'yield to him (the horse) the reins', Lat. Cic. Off. 2. 18. 64 *cedere multa multis de suo jure*.

Verbs meaning *to fall to one's lot, to become one's own*, etc., came to take the dative by two paths. On the one hand their meaning connects them very closely with verbs meaning 'to come' and 'to go', which took a local dative (p. 126 f.). Between the use of the Skt. dative in RV. 8. 103. 6 *asmai prá stóma yanty agnáye* 'to this Agni go forth the praises' and RV. 10. 23 *bhadram bhala tyásya abhüt* 'good fell to her lot' i. e. 'came to her', or CB. 10. 4. 3. 9 *kó máhyam bhágó bhasiyati* 'what part will fall to my lot?' there is so little difference that it looks as though either the two latter were patterned after the former, or these were themselves considered as verbs of motion, though used in a figurative sense, so that their dative was local. Similarly Goth. Luc. I. 14 *wairpiþ þus fahēds* 'joy falls to your lot' i. e. 'comes to you' is much like O. H. G. *thaz ouh heili queme themo manne* 'that salvation also may come to man'. On the other hand 'to fall to one's lot' or 'to become one's own' is often synonymous with 'to be given to one', so that the dative with these verbs was no doubt largely patterned after that with the passive of verbs of giving or sending and the like. Thus cf. Skt. RV. 3. 51. 6 *túbhyam bráhmāṇi gíra indra túbhyam satrā dadhire* 'to thee, Indra, prayers, to thee songs are offered altogether' with RV. 6. 44. 10 *índra túbhyam . . . abhūma vayám* 'Indra, we have become thine' lit. 'to thee'; Gr. E 652 *σοὶ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐνθάδε φημὶ φόνον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν ἐξ ἐμέθεν τεύξομαι* 'I say that death and black fate shall be brought upon you (dat.) from me' with Soph. El. 859 *πᾶσι θνατοῖς ἐφν μόρος* 'death falls to the lot of all mortals'. In the Latin 'to become' and 'to be made' are

¹ Through the association of opposites is also to be explained the dative with Skt. *ā-vraç-* 'to turn away from'; cf. Engl. 'to part with' after 'to meet with'.

so intimately associated that they have become one system, so that *factus sum* is the perfect tense of 'to become' as well as of 'to be made', while conversely *fieri* is not only 'to become', but also the passive of *facere*: *id ei loco nomen factum est* is either 'that name was given to that place' or 'became to it'.

This dative shades imperceptibly into *the dative of possession*, the only difference being that in the latter meaning the verbs, often the same as above, designate the resulting state of possession rather than the entrance into that state, so that, in as far as their datives were not used simply by analogy to the preceding, they were associated with the perfect passive tense of verbs meaning 'to give' and the like, e. g. Gr. οὐ τοι δέδοται πολεμία ἔργα would not differ much in meaning if ἐστὶ were substituted for δέδοται, i. e. if it were 'deeds of war are not to thee' i. e. 'thine' rather than 'are not given to thee'. Conversely, in the Skt. RV. I. 109. I नन्यत् युवात् प्रामतिर् अस्ति माह्यम् 'there is no other care (i. e. 'no one else who cares') for me than you', the perfect passive of 'to give' could be substituted for 'is' without affecting the meaning, and similarly in Δ 169 ἀλλά μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος σέθεν ἔσσεται 'there shall be to me (I shall have) terrible grief' or 'there shall have come to me etc.', Xen. An. I. 2. 7 ἐνταῦθα Κύρῳ βασίλειᾳ ἦν 'there Cyrus had a palace' ('a palace was built for him'), Lat. Cic. Cat. 3. 7. 16 *erat ei consilium ad facinus aptum* 'he possessed an understanding specially adapted for crime', Verg. Ec. 3. 33 *est mihi . . . domi pater* 'I have a father at home', Goth. Rom. 9. 2 *sáúrga mis ist mikila* lit. 'there is great grief to me', Luc. 8. 42 *daúhtar ainóhō was imma* 'he had one daughter only', O. Blg. *obyčajъ bě igemonu* 'the abbot had the habit'.

After the dative of the possessor was well established, it became in turn the model for the dative with certain intransitive verbs which are equivalent in meaning to 'to be' with a predicate noun. Most obviously this is the origin of the dative with verbs meaning *to be master over*, *to rule*, as Gr. ἀνάστω, βασιλεύω, Lat. *moderor*, *tempero*, *impero*, Goth. *waldan* O. Sax. *giwaldan*, O. Blg. *cěsarstvovati*, 'rule as king or emperor over', *ustojati*. Thus cf. E 546 τέκετ' Ὀρσίλοχον πολέσσον ἀνδρεσσιν ἀνακτα 'he begot O. (to be) ruler over many men', with A 288 πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάστων 'to rule over all', Lat. Oros.

6. II. *I dux his Vercingetorix fuit* 'Vercingetorix was leader for these' with Sall. J. 13. 2 *Jugurtha omni Numidiae imperare parat* 'J. prepares to rule over all Numidia'. However, the dative with these words was in some cases due to the influence of the widely prevalent transitive use of some words meaning 'to command' (p. 17), and still other bonds of connection are possible e. g. for Lat. *moderor*, which no doubt followed an expression like Eng. 'impose measure upon'.

Possibly the dative with 'to be' is also partially responsible for that with some of the verbs meaning 'to serve' (p. 134), e. g. Gr. *ἱπηρέτω* = *ἱπηρέτης εἰμί*, Lat. *servio* = *servus sum*, O. Blg. *služiti* = *sluga byti*. Cf. Soph. O. T. 410 *οὐ γάρ τι σοὶ ζῶ δοῦλος ἀλλὰ Λοξία*.

It thus appears that the dative with intransitive verbs is in every instance easily explained by direct or indirect association with datives of the secondary object (or, more rarely, old local datives), so that we need not be surprised at the varying constructions with verbs of identical meaning in the same or different languages and even with the same words of the same language. Not because we do not comprehend the point of view of the speakers of the language, as was thought e. g. by Horace C. Nutting, CJ. 2. 254, are we often puzzled by these variations, but rather because the speakers themselves had no real point of view, and mechanically reproduced combinations which they either learned from others or formed by mechanical association with other related forms of expression. There is no reason whatever to believe that a primitive I. E. people ever possessed a more definite attitude to the dative than does a living language like the German.

2. *The Dative in Looser Connection with Intransitive Verbs.*

The use of the dative in the constructions often grouped together as the 'dative of interest', when not a secondary object, merely required the development of dative endings in order to be as easily possible as the same constructions with a primary object. In addition, there were numerous paths of association of all kinds leading from individual datives of the secondary object to the same with intransitive verbs. Thus many constructions with 'to be' might as well be taken as

datives of interest, and in fact the dative of possession is itself often classified in that way. Then again there are the same connections between the looser datives of the secondary object and those with intransitive verbs, as for those more closely connected, the same influence of the active on the passive, of the passive on intransitive verbs, of phrases consisting of verb plus accusative on intransitive verbs. It would, however, be impossible in an article of this kind, even to attempt to find one's way through such an intricate network, and such connections could with any success be traced only after detailed study of the individual languages from this point of view. I therefore confine myself to giving very few representative examples of the different types which I consider needed the working together of the dative of the secondary object with the originally local dative endings.

I. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage.*¹ Skt. RV. 9. 62. 27 *túbhyemá bhúvanā kave mahimné soma tasthire túbhyam arṣanti sindhavah* 'for you this world stands, O seer, O Soma, for your glory; for you the streams flow', Gr. Xen. An. 2. 3. 15 *ai βάλανοι τῶν φουνίκων . . . τοῖς οἰκέταις ἀπέκειντο* 'the dates were laid aside for the slaves', Plat. Menex. 246 Ε ἀλλῳ γὰρ ὁ τοιοῦτος πλούτει καὶ οὐχ ἔαυτῷ 'for such a man is rich for another and not for himself', Lat. Plaut. Merc. 1. 1. 71 *tibi seris, tibi item metis* 'for yourself you sow, for yourself you likewise reap', id. Capt. 4. 2. 86 *miquidem esurio, non tibi* 'for myself I am hungry, not for you', Goth. Rom. 14. 4 *seinamma fraujin standip aíppau driusip* 'for his own master he stands or falls', O. H. G. *ir birut in liohc scinentaz* 'you are for them a shining light', Lith. *žmónės tikl sáu dírba* 'people only work for themselves', O. Blg. *sebě živeti* 'lives for himself'.

II. *The Ethical Dative.* Gr. Her. 5. 92 *τοιοῦτο μὲν ὑμῖν ἐστι η τυραννίς, ὡ Λακεδαιμόνιαι* 'there is despotism for you, O Lace-daemonians', Lat. Cic. Fam. 9. 2 *at tibi repente venit mihi Caminius* 'but, look you, suddenly Caminius comes to me',

¹ It might be possible also here to establish a subcategory of the so-called 'dativus sympatheticus' (p. 117 f.), found e. g. in Lat. Plaut. Mil. 5. 6 *quasi puerō in collo pendeant crepundia* 'as though a rattle were hanging for the boy from his neck' (i. e. 'from the boy's neck'), Goth. Joh. 11. 32 *draus imma du fōtum* 'fell before his feet' lit. 'for him before the feet'.

Germ. *das ist mir eine böse Geschichte, bei Lützen ritt ich euch unter des Feuers Blitzen auf und nieder.*¹

III. *The Dative of the Person Judging.* Av. Y. 65. 4 *kasčitča aěšqm apayžāranqm čaθwarasatəm ayarəbaranqm hvaspāi naire barəmnāi* ‘und jeder dieser Abflüsse ist 40 Tagesritte lang für einen Reiter, der gut zu Pferd ist’, Gr. Xen. An. 6. 4. 1 ή Θράκη αὐτῇ ἐστίν . . . ἐν δεξιᾷ εἰς τὸν Πόντον εἰσπλέοντι ‘this Thrace is on the right for one sailing into the Pontus’, Lat. Cat. 86. 1 *Quintia formosa est multis* ‘Quintia is beautiful in the eyes of many’, Verg. Aen. 2. 713 *est urbe egressis tumulus* ‘there is, as you come out of the city, a mound’.

IV. *The Dative of the Agent* with passive verbal adjectives. In contrast to the preceding groups this dative, since it presupposes a passive meaning of the adjective, cannot ever be traced directly to a dative of the secondary object. However, it is so close in its use to the other ‘datives of interest’ when independent of a primary object, that it is easily derived from them: cf. Skt. RV. 1. 33. 2 *stotýbhyo háryo ásti* ‘for the singers is one who must be called upon’ i. e. ‘must be called upon by the singers’, ib. 1. 75. 4 *sákhībhya īdyah* lit. ‘for the friends one who must be honored’, Gr. Xen. An. 1. 3. 15 ἡμοὶ τοῦτο οὐ ποιητέον ‘this is for me something that should not be done’, id. Mem. 3. 6. 3 ὁφελητέα σοι ή πόλις ἐστί ‘the city is for you one to whom aid should be given’ i. e. ‘should be aided by you’, Lat. Cic. Cat. 3. 12. 28 *vobis erit videndum* ‘this will be for you something to be attended to’. This dative with the ‘participium necessitatis’ is thus still a dative of interest, and only when it is also used with other passive participles, e. g. Cic. Leg. Agr. 1. 25 *mihi deliberatum et constitutum est* ‘it has been deliberated and resolved by me’, or even with finite verb forms (e. g. Xen. An. 1. 8. 13 πάνθ' ἡμῖν πεποίηται ‘everything has been done by us’), can one really speak of a dative of the agent.

3. *The Dative of Purpose.*

The dative of purpose with intransitive verbs might sometimes be local (cf. p. 124), but more often is developed from the dative of purpose with transitive verbs in the same ways as

¹ From Brugmann, op. cit. 556.

the other datives of the sole object in looser connection with the verb are derived from the same uses with a primary object, and was, moreover, also closely associated with other more loosely connected datives and grew up together with them, often differing not so much in the meaning of the case, as in the mere fact that the dative of purpose was usually an abstract noun as opposed to the prevailing personal datives of interest. Particularly in the case of the dative of purpose with verbs meaning 'to be' does the close connection with the other datives appear. Cf. Skt. RV. I. 37. 15 *ásti hí smā mādāya vah* 'something is there for you, for intoxication', where the personal dative of advantage and the abstract dative of purpose are parallel and seem to differ only as to their stem meaning. Similar abstract datives with 'to be' are Av. *nitəmačit̄ haomahūtiš hazarəraynyādi asti daēvanqm* 'even the slightest haoma-pressing is for (i. e. serves the purpose of) thousandfold killing of Daevas', Lat. Caes. B. G. 4. 25 *magno usui nostris fuit* 'it was for (i. e. of) great service to our men', O. Blg. *pōzoru bēachq* 'dienten zum Schauspiel'.

Of datives of purpose with other intransitive verbs I may mention the following, the first again showing the parallelism between such a dative and the personal datives: Skt. RV. I. 30. 6 *ürdhvás tiṣṭhā na utáye* 'arise for us for help', RV. 10. 109. 4 *tápase yé niṣedīt̄* 'who have sat down for penance', Av. Y. 50. 7 *mahmāi kiyātā avārahē* 'be ready for my help', Lat Caes. B. G. 2. 29. 1 *auxilio Nerviis venirent* 'came for assistance (i. e. to help) to the Nervii'.

The following are examples of the dative of purpose with passives, one of the intermediate links which connect those with and without a primary object: Skt. MS. 3. I. 3 (4. 1) *ānnāya ca khálū vai gātāve cāgnīc cīyate* 'for (obtaining) food and a course Agni is piled up', Lat. Caes. B. G. I. 42. 3 *dies conloquio dictus est* 'a day was set for an interview'. As is seen from the Skt. example particularly, these datives may also be concrete like those with the active (p. 119 f.).

4. *The Dative with Substantives.*

We have seen above that a large part of these were local, while the primitive dative of the secondary object could never be used with substantives. After the development of a for-

mally differentiated dative and its consequent use with intransitive verbs, it became possible also to use the dative with verbal substantives which were associated with these verbs regardless of the possibility of conceiving the case locally, and regardless of the difference between the singular and plural. Thus one could now use expressions like Gr. Plat. Ap. 30 D *τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δόσιν ὑμῖν* 'the gift of the god to you', Aesch. Pr. 612 πυρὸς βροτοῖς δοτῆρ' ὁρᾶς Προμηθέα 'you see Prometheus, the giver of fire to mortals' as well as corresponding singular datives, and one might use in all numbers similar datives which could not be felt locally, e. g. Xen. An. 5. 6. 29 ἐπιβούλῃ ἐμοί 'a plot against me' (like ἐπιβούλευεν), Plat. Legg. 773 Ε τῷ θεῷ ὑπηρέτας¹ 'servants to the god' (like ὑπηρετεῖν), Lat. Cic. Legg. I. 15. 42 *obtemperatio scriptis legibus* 'obedience to the written laws' (like *obtemperare*), Plaut. Am. I. I. 14 *opulento homini . . . servitus* 'being servant to a rich man' (like *servire*), similarly O. Blg. *slugovanije tčlu* 'corpori servire'.

Altogether different from these datives are certain common datives of interest with substantives, e. g. Skt. RV. *dásyare vŕkah* 'a wolf for the enemy' (proper name), Av. V. 5. 20 *vāstramča gave* 'and fodder for the cattle', Gr. τ 144 Λαέρτῳ ἥρωι ταφήμον 'a shroud for the hero L.', Lat. Liv. I. 20. 4 *pectori tegumen* 'a covering for the breast', Osc. Kerri *statif* 'a statue to Ceres', Goth. Marc. 2. 28 *frauja . . . pamma sabbatō* 'lord for (i. e. over) the sabbath', Lith. *rugiai séklai* 'rye for seed', O. Blg. *vtsēmъ rabъ* 'a servant to all'. Since such uses must under any theory of the dative be traced to isolation from phrases in which verbs meaning 'to be' and the like were used in addition to the two substantives, these are of no further importance for our purposes. Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr 3. 402, Gr. 2. 2². 561 f.

5. The Datives with Adjectives.

Except in so far as these were of local origin (p. 128), they are also necessarily derived from the datives with verbs of related form or meaning. Cf. Brugmann op. cit. 563 f. Since here also our opinion of the history of the I. E. dative will in no way cause a different attitude to these constructions, I

¹ Not a good example. θεῷ depends on παραδεῦται. In Anab. 5, 6, 29 φατνούτο must be reckoned with.—[C. W. E. M.]

refrain from more than mere mention, particularly since an attempt to trace the origin of the dative with the individual adjectives would be a matter of great length and intricacy.

It will now be in order to summarize what I consider the points of superiority of the point of view here presented over both the local and the grammatical theories of the dative, the superiority of the hypothesis namely, that the I. E. dative was in its first origin an uninflected case of the secondary object, which had certain points of contact with a local case somewhat like the locative in the singular, and with the ablative in the plural, and that from this partially common sphere of usage complete syncretism resulted, so that the uninflected case gave way everywhere to the clearer inflected originally local forms. This hypothesis avoids both the objections to the purely local theory, which plainly conflicts with the actual uses of the dative and the psychic attitude to the same in living languages, and those to the grammatical theory, which makes the impossible assumption that an inflected form had from the beginning those non-sensuous meanings which otherwise come from sensuous meanings after long processes of development. The origin of the dative from purely syntactic combinations *has* enabled us to see why it was from the beginning a vague and principally non-sensuous case; but it has not forced us to believe that as human intelligence has been more highly developed, the appreciation of the subtle relations as expressed by the cases has become more blunt instead of the reverse, and that the present-day attitude to such forms is merely a vague remnant of primitive acute discrimination. Furthermore, since the province of such an uninflected dative of the secondary object embraced the roots of most of the historic uses of the dative as exemplified by a very considerable percentage of actually occurring instances, we are in this way no longer forced to believe that a very few petrified remnants incorporate the original uses of the case, while all the various actual uses have spread out from this phantom. A further point of advantage lies herein that it brings into relation with the actual uses of the dative the fact that the singular ending is probably locatival and the plural

ablative, and still does not attribute to those endings an independent development of uses so far from them as most of the dative uses. Then too the notion of syncretism has this advantage over a purely local theory, that we now understand why the dative was limited to directive or at the most also terminative local notions. However freely these forms were used in various local significations before syncretism with the case of the secondary object, yet the fact that only in the directive or terminative sense there was any common ground, and the overwhelming frequency of the uses of the primitive dative of the secondary object as opposed to the purely local uses, resulted in confining the latter to those situations in which a certain resemblance was felt to the non-local uses, and even there a feeling of strangeness caused the purely local uses to become more and more restricted, though occasionally, as in the Latin poets, these remnants might be artificially developed so as again to give the appearance of distinct local functions. Last, but not least, the idea of syncretism assumes a process that has most striking historical parallels in the development of the Romance dative from an originally localistic prepositional phrase, which took the place of the old dative through an exactly similar process of syncretism, as also in the gradual encroachment of the English phrases with *to* on almost all uses of the simple case of the indirect object. The theory of the syncretistic origin of the dative, then, avoids the objections to both local and grammatical theories, combines the advantages of both, and explains other features which both of the other theories cannot explain.

WALTER PETERSEN.

BETHANY COLLEGE, LINDSBORG, KANSAS.

II.—PROBLEMS IN DELPHIAN CHRONOLOGY.

The inscriptions from Delphi have given us a fairly complete list of the archons of the third century, but, as yet, scholars have been unable to determine their chronological order with exactness. Prosopographical evidence is in many documents the sole criterion, and this allows a wide margin of variability; for the active public life of a citizen in this small community might extend over thirty or forty years, and we cannot always be certain that senator Chares may not be son or grandson of Chares who held office a few years previously. Some help may be gained from the history of Aitolian alliances, or enmities, during the period of Aitolian supremacy at Delphi; for the Delphians would hardly venture to make a grant to a citizen of a state with whom Aitolia was at war. The style of the writing may sometimes be used as a help in determining the date, but this criterion may be abused even by an expert, and when epigraphists such as Colin and Pomtow vary by thirty or forty years in dating certain archons, it is evident that conclusions based solely on letter forms cannot be viewed without grave suspicion. The most important of the Delphian documents for establishing the chronology are the Amphiktyonic decrees. When Delphi came under Aitolian domination after the repulse of the Gauls, Aitolia took her place amongst the members of the Amphiktyonic Council, and, as her League expanded, she added to her representation in the Council by taking over the votes once held by the newly won territory. This growth was not consistently steady throughout the century but fluctuated with the fortunes of the Aitolian League. She had two votes in Hieron's archonship, nine in Aristagoras', six in Athambos', fourteen in Nikarchos' year. It is evident, therefore, that when we can trace the various steps in the League's expansion, we have an invaluable means of determining the dates of the Amphiktyonic decrees. Unfortunately, the literary records of the Aitolian League are few and much of our knowledge of its growth

has to be determined from the inscriptions. In most cases, therefore, this argument runs in a circle and proves nothing. We find a most important means of dating these documents in the fact that Makedon and Makedonian dependents sent no delegates to the Council during the period of Aitolian supremacy. The reason is no doubt political and a question of prestige. Aitolia and Antigonos were generally on friendly terms, or perhaps we might call the attitude of Aitolia that of benevolent neutrality. We can not find the reason for Makedon's refusal to share in the proceedings of the Council in Aitolia's attitude but rather in that of Antigonos.¹ When he had become firmly established on his throne, Aitolia already controlled the policies of the Council either by her own votes or by those of friendly states. If Makedonian representatives were to attend, they would either have to follow Aitolia's lead or be outvoted. Antigonos had two alternatives before him, either to attempt to deprive Aitolia of her leadership by force or to abstain from the Council altogether. He had no particular quarrel with Aitolia and he chose the latter policy, incidentally bidding the subject states to do likewise. Previous writers on Delphian chronology have not always taken full account of this situation in dating the Amphiktyonic decrees. For example, Ferguson² dates the independence of Athens ca. 229 while Pomtow³ places the archon Athambos, in whose year Athens had a representative at the Council, in 236. One or both of these dates must be wrong. Again, Colin and Pomtow date Lyson in 243, in whose archonship an Athenian of the tribe Ptolemais was given certain honors, while writers on Athenian chronology claim that Ptolemais was not created until at least ten years later. Therefore, if excuse be needed for the present study, we plead that greater precision in the chronology of the third century has been attained in recent years and that new light has been thrown on the political affiliations of many of the Greek states during that period, and we believe that by means of this evidence a more exact dating of some of the Delphic documents may be obtained.

¹ Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 212 ff., defines very clearly the relationship of Antigonos to Aitolia.

² Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 231.

³ His latest chronological tables are published in *Klio* 1914, 305.

All those who have studied the Delphic inscriptions, will readily agree that the Amphiktyonic decrees must be the starting-point for any discussion of the chronology during Aitolian domination. Pomtow made the first important contribution to the study of this group of decrees.¹ He was followed by Beloch, who made the growth of the Aitolian League the basis of his investigations, but who, though his researches mark a considerable advance, carried out his theories in too mechanical a fashion, not allowing for such fluctuations in the history of the League as were caused, for example, by the war with Demetrios.² Nikitsky has also contributed a series of articles on this group of decrees, but, unfortunately for us, his work is in Russian and inaccessible. We have been able to use his results only in so far as they have been incorporated by Pomtow in his recent articles. Walek has taken the Amphiktyonic Council as the subject of his doctoral thesis.³ His work is more interesting as a youthful polemic against Pomtow and Beloch than as a valuable contribution to the subject. Yet it is valuable as a reference work and in some points has corrected errors made by his predecessors. The last discussion of the subject comes from Pomtow⁴ who in summing up all the available evidence gives much that is new and establishes the succession of certain archons whose date had been undetermined. Colin and Bourguet have promised a chronological study of the third century, but, if we may judge by the list published by Colin,⁵ the variations from that published by Pomtow will not be great—at least as regards the date of the Amphiktyonic decrees.

In our opinion the key of the whole problem of the chronology of Groups I-IV of the Amphiktyonic Decrees lies in Group II.⁶ Here Pomtow and all scholars succeeding Beloch

¹ Jahrb. 1894, 497-558; 1897, 737 ff., 785 ff. Pauly-Wissowa, RE, s. v. Delphoi. Cf. Baunack, SGDI II 939 ff.

² Klio II (1902), 205 ff. Republished with corrections Gr. Gesch. III 2, 322 ff.

³ Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aitolischen Herrschaft. A review of this thesis by Ruesch (GGA 1913, 125 ff.) is interesting.

⁴ Klio 1914, 265 ff.; cf. GGA 1913, 143 ff.

⁵ Fouilles de Delphes III 2, 392 ff.

⁶ This numbering is given to accord with Pomtow's latest arrangement. It would have been better if he had eliminated such lettering as Ia, VIIa, VIIb and numbered these lists consecutively.

in both Delphian and Athenian chronology have accepted Beloch's dates without question. The archons in this group are Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton who follow in the order named. From the Amphiktyonic decrees dated in their archonships we learn that Athens, Eretria, and Sikyon were now represented at the Council. If we accept Beloch's conclusions we must assume that the two former states were independent of Makedon at this time and that Sikyon had finally shaken off the tyrants who had so long held the government in their grip. In reopening this subject, the only possible method of investigation is to take up the threads of the history of these three states and see where they lead us. We must determine what conditions existed in Athens, Eretria, and Sikyon in 273-271, and, if Beloch is incorrect in his interpretation of their history at that time, we must find some consecutive period of three years which does satisfy all conditions.

Since we have a more complete knowledge of Athenian than of Eretrian or Sikyonian history, we may properly consider the Athenian vote at the Council first. It is generally agreed that Group II cannot date before 279 or after 262. We are therefore justified in limiting our study to that period. The Chremonidean War raged between 267 and 262 when Athens was undoubtedly independent of Makedon and might easily have sent her delegate to the Council, although, according to Beloch's or Pomtow's arrangement of the Amphiktyonic decrees, none were sent. Between 279 and 268 is found one of the most obscure periods of Athenian history, for literary and epigraphical documents fail us almost completely and there is little unanimity amongst scholars in the interpretation of the records which undoubtedly do belong to this period. It is held by some that Athens was twice independent and twice under Makedonian dictatorship during these years. Others maintain that Athens was subject to Antigonos during the entire period. Should the latter prove to be the case, Beloch's dates for Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton must be rejected at once.

The chief arguments for the independence of Athens in 279-268 are as follows: Athenian troops helped to drive back the Gauls at Thermopylai; the Board of Administration served in the archonship of Glaukippos, who is dated by some

in 277/6; Athens sent an embassy to Pyrrhos after he had driven Antigonos out of Makedon; Aitolia invited Athens to share in the Soteria in the archonship of Polyeuktos when Aitolia and Antigonos were supposed to be at enmity with each other; the decree in honor of Demochares in the archonship of Pytharatos could not have been passed if Athens had been dominated by Makedon; last but not least, the decrees of the Council in Group II are accepted without question as belonging to this period and therefore prove beyond a doubt that Athens was independent in 273-271.

The last argument is a good example of reasoning in a circle and may be rejected at present. Of the others, we believe that none can be held as a proof that Athens was independent at any time between 279 and 268. They may be dealt with very briefly. In the first place it is evident that Athens became Makedonian in the archonship of Nikias Otryneus, which is proved by the fact that the *agonothete* was changed in the course of that year and the second incumbent was a pro-Makedonian.¹ There is no evidence that Athens became independent when the Gauls drove Antigonos out of his kingdom. It might have been possible to regain her freedom at that time, but the harbors were in the king's possession and no grain could be imported without his consent. If the Gauls were to ravage her fields, Athens would have been ground between the upper and the nether millstones. In this crisis of Greek civilization she preferred to remain loyal to Antigonos, a loyalty which was rendered easier because of the moderate rule of Phaidros, the agent of Antigonos at that time. Whether the Athenian troops at Thermopylai were sent by Athens or by Antigonos we do not know, but whatever their status, their presence there can not be used as an argument to prove the independence of the city.

The date of Glaukippos is bound up with the question of the secretary-cycle where we have a wide divergency of

¹ Syll.² 200, 213. Cf. Tarn, op. cit., 127 n. It should be noted that Kirchner in Syll.² 365 follows Sundwall in assigning Glaukon's year of service as *agonothete* to 296/5, thus giving him an active public life of 50 years or more. He was still in high favor at the Egyptian court after 247 (*ibid.* no. 462). While this is possible, Koehler's dating is much to be preferred.

opinion.¹ Apart from our own particular theory, which we prefer to follow, there are many good reasons for believing that this archon must belong to the period of the Chremonidean War. If Glaukippos was archon in 277/6, Athens was independent because of the Board of Administration which is found in decrees of this archonship. The pro-Makedonians were also in power because the son of Phaidros was elected as *agonothete*. If Athens was independent in that year, it is strange that she should have come over to the side of Antigonos in the following year while Antigonos was still struggling with the Gauls and was apparently without resources or friends. The sacrifices for safety in the archonship of Glaukippos point to the fact that his year of office fell at a time when Athens was at war and in danger, and the prosopographical evidence favors a later date. In fact, it is practically certain that this archon belongs to the Chremonidean War and no inferences can be drawn from the decrees dated under him that Athens was independent in 277.

The story of the embassy from Athens to Pyrrhos comes from Justin. Unfortunately, no details are given and its purpose is left to conjecture. If it were merely congratulatory the historian would probably have made no mention of it in his brief summary. If an alliance was requested, Pyrrhos would hardly have refused and the fact would undoubtedly have been recorded. We are inclined to believe, therefore, that this embassy was not from the state but from the Nationalists who sought the help of Pyrrhos in throwing off the Makedonian yoke. They had not the courage to undertake a revolt unaided and powerful forces were needed to regain control of the harbors. Whatever the purpose of the embassy, it was apparently unsuccessful, for Pyrrhos paid no heed to Athens but went on to Sparta. It is important to note that Antigonos followed hard after him apparently without let or hindrance from Athens who might easily have barred the way if she were in alliance with Pyrrhos. But Athens was offering sacrifices for Antigonos in the archonship of Polyeuktos and in the following year she was clearly of the same mind, for she publicly decreed thanks to the officials in charge of

¹ CP 1914, 248 ff., AJP 1915, 438 ff. Cf. Klio 1914, 269.

those sacrifices. We may readily conclude that the government of Athens was loyal to Antigonos in spite of his reverses at the hands of Pyrrhos.

The invitation from Aitolia to Athens to join in celebrating the Soteria can imply that Athens was independent only in the case that Aitolia and Antigonos were at enmity. Tarn believes that Aitolia gave support to Pyrrhos in transferring him across the Gulf of Corinth.¹ If this was the route actually taken by the king on his way to Sparta we must grant that the neutrality of Aitolia was being stretched to the limit. That Aitolia was ever at war with Antigonos or actively supporting his enemies, there is no evidence whatsoever. Athens could take part in the Soteria without being independent or without sending representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council. This is clearly shown in the "Soteria" inscriptions. We do not believe therefore that the invitation extended in the archonship of Polyeuktos can carry any implication that Athens was at that time independent.

The decree of Laches in honor of Demochares has been used to prove that Athens was free in 271. Ferguson² however has shown that this document is skilfully worded so as not to give offence to Antigonos. Moreover Diogenes Laertios³ has recorded a conversation between Demochares and Zenon which seems to imply that the former had been admitted to the friendship of the king and was in the habit of corresponding with him. In that case the decree of Laches would not have given offence to the king and may have been prompted by him.

These are the arguments which have been cited to prove that Athens was independent at certain times between 279 and 268 B. C. While we are willing to admit that our interpretation of this evidence may appear to be biased by our particular prejudices and theories about this period, yet we contend that these arguments, singly or collectively, can not be used to prove that Antigonos had ever lost his grip on the city. There is, on the other hand, no lack of evidence to show that Athens was Makedonian. In the archonship of Nikias

¹ Tarn, op. cit., 266 n.

² Op. cit., 169-173. Cf. Tarn, op. cit., 268.

³ VII 14.

Otryneus, the pro-Antigonid Phaidros was elected *agonothete*.¹ In the archonship of Euboulos Athens was still a Makedonian state as the decree in honor of Phaidros shows.² The large erasures in this document must have contained references to Demetrios and Antigonos and could only have been written when Makedonian interests were dominant. Athens sent no *hieromnemon* to the Council when Hieron was archon at Delphi. This fact implies that the city was under Makedonian control ca. 278-275. Sacrifices were offered to Antigonos in the archonship of Polyeuktos, and in the following year the government thanked those who had offered them. Diogenes Laertios says that Antigonos often came to Athens in Zenon's lifetime. It is clear that the king must have been so thoroughly occupied with military campaigns from 279 to 272 that these visits must have been rare during these years. We must suppose, therefore, that these trips to his intellectual capital took place in the four or five years that followed the death of Pyrrhos and preceded the Chremonidean War. Finally, all the inscriptions which surely belong to the years 279-268 show that the Department of Administration was in charge of a single officer, a fact which points to Makedonian domination during those years.³

The whole trend of the literary and epigraphical evidence dealing with the history of Athens between 279 and 268 seems clearly in favor of the theory that Athens was Makedonian during that period. On this score alone the arguments of Beloch in favor of dating Group II of the Amphiktyonic decrees in 273-1 might be rejected. When we turn to the history of Eretria and Sikyon the evidence, though scanty, is overwhelmingly against his dates for this group of decrees. Apparently his interpretation of this evidence led him to say that the Athenian vote at the Council must *antedate* the Chremonidean War. This part of his argument must therefore be examined with the greatest care.

The relation of Eretria to Makedon in the seventies is bound up with the story of the death of Menedemos. There are two traditions.⁴ According to one, Menedemos proposed a decree of congratulation to Antigonos for his victory over the Gauls at Lysimacheia (ca. 276). Since the actual word-

¹ Cf. page 149, note 1.

² AJP 1915, 438 ff.

³ IG II^a 682.

⁴ Diog. Laert. II 141 ff.

ing of the decree is given this part of the story may be genuine, and would be conclusive proof that the city was Makedonian at the time, but the historian goes on to say that the Eretrians were so enraged at the proposed decree that they banished Menedemos who fled to Oropos whence he was driven out on the charge that he had stolen some golden vessels from the shrine of Amphiaraos. After wandering about for some time he finally reached Makedon where he died in great wretchedness. This version of the fate of Menedemos, which is accepted by Beloch, is not only improbable in itself, but is flatly denied by Antigonos of Karystos—a contemporary of Menedemos—who says that Menedemos went to the court of the king who had once been his pupil and begged him to restore his country's freedom. Antigonos wished to grant his request but finally, on the advice of Persaios, refused to do so. Menedemos was so grieved that he starved himself to death. Herakleides and Diogenes Laertios support this version of the story and in our opinion there is little doubt that it is the correct tradition. Eretria must have been held by the garrisons of Antigonos at the time of Menedemos' death or ca. 272. Persaios probably arrived at the court of Antigonos ca. 275. He must have been there some time if his influence could outweigh that of Menedemos over his former pupil and friend. It is possible that Menedemos did not prefer his request until after the death of Pyrrhos when Antigonos was at last securely seated on his throne. In any case, the evidence that Eretria was independent in this period may be safely rejected as unsound. We believe, therefore, that Beloch's argument for the date of Group II, in so far as it is based on the Eretrian vote at the Amphiktyonic Council, cannot be considered as a valid one and must be rejected.

Beloch's strongest argument for dating Group II in 273-271 is found in his interpretation of Sikyonian history. Fortunately, the literary tradition here is direct and there is no conflict of ancient authorities, though Beloch has allowed himself unusual freedom in dealing with his sources.

In 251 Aratos led the attack which won the freedom of his native city Sikyon. According to Polybios, he was then twenty years of age.¹ He was appointed general of the Achaian

¹ Polybios II 43. 3.

League for the second time in 243. His first appointment must have been in 245¹ at the latest. Beloch maintains that he could not have held this office before the age of thirty and that we must accordingly interpret the statement of Polybios as meaning that Aratos was "ein Zwanziger" in 251 or about 25 or 26 years old. This argument is wholly untenable. In the first place Polybios is too precise to use his numerals in such a vague manner and no example of this indefinite method of expressing age is known to us from the classical authors. Nor is it likely that Polybios is making a mistake about the age of his hero. In compiling his history he undoubtedly had the Memoirs of Aratos before him and we may eliminate the possibility of an error.² Moreover, Plutarch emphasizes the extreme youth (*μεράκιον*) of Aratos in recording his earlier achievements. We should therefore accept the statement of Polybios at its face value and put the birth of Aratos in 271 and not in 276/5 as Beloch does. This is a most important date, for on the year of Aratos' birth depends all Delphian chronology for the third century and much that is vital in Athenian and Eretrian history. From the date established by Beloch, he and succeeding scholars have dated Group II of the Amphiktyonic lists and most of the Delphian archons between 279 and 230. And from this evidence the independence of Athens and Eretria in 273-271 has been inferred.

We must now take the year 271 as our pivotal point and arrange our chronological scheme accordingly. Aratos was seven years old when his father Kleinias was slain by Abantidas. Thus the democratic government which had been in existence for a very short time was overthrown and a tyranny re-established. It was during this short era of democracy, which we must date in the year or years preceding the assassination of Kleinias in 264, that Sikyon once more sent her delegate to the Amphiktyonic Council. As Tarn suggests, the democratic uprising in Sikyon may have been a direct outcome of the influence of Ptolemy in bringing about the Chremonidean war.

¹ Plutarch, Aratos 16. Polybios XX 4.

² Cf. Tarn, op. cit., 361 n.

The results of our investigations may be summed up very briefly. All the evidence shows that Sikyon must have sent her delegates to the Council in or immediately preceding the year 264. Secondly the balance of evidence is decidedly in favor of the theory that Eretria belonged to Makedon at the time of and preceding Menedemos' death ca. 275–272. There is no trustworthy evidence which shows that this state was independent at any time between 279 and 268. Finally Athens came under Makedonian control in the year 280/79 and there is no proof that she became independent at any time before the Chremonidean War. Antigonos undoubtedly exercised only a mild form of tyranny over Athens and Eretria due to the fact that in each resided old teachers and friends for whom he had the greatest affection and respect. Both states were virtually free in so far as the exercise of all the usual forms of democracy went, but the presence of strong garrisons in Peiraeus and Chalkis was an ever-present reminder to these liberty-loving people that the iron hand was there. We may easily conclude that none of these states sent representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council before the outbreak of the Chremonidean War. Beloch's dates for Group II must therefore be discarded.

Having destroyed this sole island of safety in the vexed chronology of the Delphic archons, we must endeavor to re-establish it in some more secure spot where it will be immune from attack. In doing so, we must rebuild our chronological scheme on the sound political principle that no Greek state which acknowledged the authority of Makedon sent representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council while it was dominated by Aitolia.

Aristagoras, Charixenos, Herakleidas, Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton may be grouped together; for they follow each other in the order named.¹ Under Archiadas and Eudokos alone do we find the Sicyonian delegation to the Council. The latest possible date for Eudokos must be 264/3 B. C. Archiadas therefore falls in 265/4, Herakleidas in 266/5, Charixenos in 267/6 and Aristagoras in 268/7. Straton succeeds Eudokos and must be dated in 263/2.² It will be

¹ Pomtow, GGA 1913, 143 ff.

² Here I make amends to Beloch for my criticism of his view that Straton must be dated in a pre-Pythian year.

noticed at once that Athens has no representatives in the Council in 268/7, but they appear for the first time at the Fall meeting in 267/6, that is, at the beginning of the Chremonidean War. Here is striking confirmation of the correctness of our chronology, for the Athenian and Sikyonian records are in complete agreement that both were free and independent at or within this period.

If we accept these dates for the archons of Groups Ia and II, and evidently we must do so, we have important confirmatory evidence for the date of the beginning of the war. Of vastly more importance is the fixing of the Athenian chronology and the whole secretary-cycle for the first half of the third century, since Peithidemos, in whose year the decree of Chremonides was passed, must now be settled in 267/6 and Philokrates must go in 266/5 thereby definitely establishing the tribe Demetrias in the rotation of the secretaries in that year.¹ The decrees of the Council may also be used as evidence that Eretria at least and possibly a great part of Euboea became independent of Makedon. No mention is made of this state in the decree of Chremonides and we must assume that Eretria gained her freedom after that decree was passed but before the autumnal meeting of the Amphiktyonic Council. It is quite possible that Eretria did not join the alliance against Antigonos, but it would be difficult to understand how she could remain neutral after the stroke which won her freedom. Whether Chalkis succeeded in getting rid of the Makedonian garrison is questionable. In the archonship of Straton we find amongst the hieromnemons this entry: Εὐβοέων Ἀμφικράτους Χαλκιδέος. The addition of the chorographic adjective at this period is unusual and probably has some special significance, the nature of which we are not yet in a position to define. The history of Chalkis during the war is veiled in Stygian darkness. Scholars have usually assumed that this post remained under the control of Antigonos until the revolt of Alexander some years later ca. 253/2. This opinion may have to be revised.

These Amphiktyonic decrees not only help us to determine the beginning of the Chremonidean War but they enable us to fix its duration. In the Fall meeting in 262 Athens had a

¹ CP 1914, 248 ff.; 1915, 457 ff.

delegate at the Council.¹ We know from other sources that Athens fell about September or October of that year. Evidently the Council met before the surrender. Athens sent no more representatives until she regained her freedom in 233/2. The other votes which we find in these decrees tell us little beyond what we already know about the Chremonidean War. We cannot tell whether Sikyon took any part in it, but it may be noted that the murder of Kleinias and the reestablishment of a tyranny followed hard after the victory of Antigonos over the Spartans. It would seem as if this were a direct result of the decline in the Allies' fortunes, and it may be that Sikyon was ranged against Antigonos as well.

After the Chremonidean War all the states of the Peloponnes disappear from the records of the Council if we except the Spartan vote which was registered in the archonship of Kallikles. The Achaian League followed the policy of Antigonos in holding aloof from a Council whose proceedings they could not dominate. It is more difficult to understand why the other members of the Council who did not belong to the Achaian League should abstain from attending. Possibly the influence of Antigonos may have extended farther than we are accustomed to believe. It is evident, too, that much is yet to be learned about the history of Sparta in this period.

By shifting the group Aristagoras-Straton from 276-271 to 268-263, the arrangements of the archons subsequent to 279 must be changed. Pomtow places Erasippos in 279. In this archonship a decree was passed by which Glaukon, the brother of Chremonides, was made *proxenos*. It is probable that such a gift would not have been conferred when Athens was Makedonian, but it can be dated with comparative certainty in the days of Athenian independence. Since there is no available place for Erasippos during the Chremonidean War, we do not hesitate to date this archon in one of the vacant years between 288 and 280—possibly ca. 282.

Hieron may belong anywhere between 278 and 275 or 273 and 272 according to Beloch. We are inclined to believe that the latter alternative is not to be considered. The victories of Pyrrhos do not mean that Thessaly became independent of

¹ *Klio* 1914, 285.

Makedon in 273. She only experienced a change of masters, for Pyrrhos was not making this wild raid through Makedon for any altruistic ideas in regard to the liberties of smaller nations. Probably we should date the decree as late as possible in the years 278-275, for we doubt whether these privileges accorded to the *technitai* were sought while the Gauls were still a real menace to safe travelling. In 276 Antigonos won his decisive victory at Lysimacheia and we may suppose that he turned his attention to the reduction of Thessaly very soon thereafter. Hieron may be dated ca. 276/5. [Could we bring into this connection the decree in which the Amphiktyons return thanks to Ptolemy and Antigonos for granting safe conduct to the sacred embassies, we would be justified in dating Hieron as late as possible. But the reference to the secretary of the Council seems to relegate this decree to the latter part of the century (cf. GGA 1913, 171 f.)].

Kraton is probably contemporary with, or immediately follows, the Attic archon Polyeuktos, as Pomtow has shown, but there are many reasons which forbid the dating of this archon in 277/6. Apart from our own construction of the Athenian secretary-cycle by which we date Polyeuktos in 273/2, it does not seem humanly possible that the Soteria could have been celebrated in 276/5. In the first place, the danger of a Gallic invasion was not removed until after the battle of Lysimacheia in 276, and it may be seriously doubted whether Aitolia had thought of instituting the festival until that time. Secondly, embassies had to be sent over the ancient world to win the approval of the various Greek city-states. Other preliminaries had to be arranged even after their approval was won. Means of communication were none too good and travel by sea none too secure, even for a neutral. The difficulty of arranging the Olympic games in modern times might offer a parallel. With all the advantages of speedy communication it takes years before all details are settled. Since the evidence from Athenian history establishes Polyeuktos in 273/2, the Soteria were not celebrated before 272/1, or four years after the battle of Lysimacheia. It is probable that Kraton should be dated in 272/1. The prosopographical evidence seems to favor this date rather than the middle of the century where Colin prefers to place him.

It is apparent from the decree of the Chians that the Soteria were to be held quadrennially when they were first instituted. Pomtow's restoration of that inscription seems to be correct and shows that they were to be held in the same year as the Olympic games.¹ As a matter of common sense we should expect that the new quadrennial festival would come midway between the Pythian festivals. The original plan was not long maintained but very soon the Aitolians decided to hold it oftener. At any rate, when we come to the "Soteria" group of inscriptions, the evidence is clear that the new games were either annual or biennial. Beloch and Walek hold that they were biennial.² Pomtow³ contends that they must be annual. Both base their arguments on Beloch's dates for the archons in Groups I-II, but, since we have rejected these dates, we must consider the evidence from our new point of view.

In dating Group III we have three lines of evidence, one of which is based partly on literary tradition. In the archonship of Emmenidas, a decree was passed in honor of Areus II, king of Sparta. The attempts of Bourguet⁴ and Pomtow⁵ to identify this Areus with Areus I may be rejected without comment. Areus I was killed at Corinth in 265/4, and his son Akrotatos met with a similar end ca. 262. Akrotatos left a son Areus who, though a mere babe, seems to have been crowned king. He died in his eighth year, hence not later than 254 and probably earlier. Emmenidas must therefore be dated between 262 and 254 and probably towards the upper limit.

The prosopographical evidence requires that we date Group III as early as possible.⁶ Telestes, for example, won a victory in 284 and again ca. 263 at Delos and in the archonship of Nikodamos at Delphi. While the active life of an actor might have easily been thirty or even forty years, it is probable that his victories could not have been beyond thirty years apart, and in most cases a shorter period must be assumed. The Athenian lists do not help us very much because we are far from accuracy

¹ *Klio* 1914, 272 f.

² Cf. page 147, notes 2 and 3.

³ *GGA* 1913, 178 ff.

⁴ *BCH* 1911, 488 ff. Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.* 304 n.

⁵ *GGA* 1913, 150 ff.

⁶ Cf. O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting*, p. 70.

in dating the actors of the third century, although the margin of error is probably not great. For our purposes we may confine ourselves to the evidence afforded by the Delian inscriptions. This is solely prosopographical, but in every case it favors the earliest possible dates for Group III. Nikodamos must be dated in a year when the Pythia were celebrated, and though it is possible that he should go in 254/3, yet it is very improbable. We should not hesitate to assign him to 258/7. It follows from this that the Soteria at that time must have been celebrated annually, for Aristagoras and Emmenidas must be placed in the three years immediately preceding Nikodamos. This would be impossible if the festival were biennial.

Our third chain of reasoning leads to the same conclusion, though all the links are not yet thoroughly tested. We may take it for granted that the Amphiktyonic decrees from the archonship of Kallikles and the so-called "Kallikles" group must lie in the interval between the Chremonidean War and the Boiotian War in 245/4. It is certain that Nikodamos and Dion belong to years when the Pythia were celebrated. If Dion is placed in 250 we are compelled to date Praochos in 246/5 since the succession of the archons in Group IV is definitely fixed. In that case Boiotia would have a representative at the Amphiktyonic Council in the spring of 245, or at a time when she was in open war with Aitolia.¹ This is clearly impossible and our only alternative is to date Dion in 254. Nikodamos must therefore be placed in 258. Since Aristagoras and Emmenidas fall between two successive celebrations of the Pythia we should have no further hesitation in asserting that the Soteria were annual by 260 at the latest. In all probability the change from a quadrennial to an annual festival was made in that year, for the period of the Chremonidean war would be most inopportune for inaugurating annual games and contests. Kallikles cannot be placed in the year of a Pythian festival according to our arrangement of the archons of this period.² The mem-

¹ *Klio* 1914, 310 f.; SIG I⁸ 444/5. On the date of the war see Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 384.

² Pomtow seems to have abandoned his theory that Kallikles and Pleiston must belong to years when the Pythia were celebrated (GGA 1913, 149 f.; *Klio* 1914, 305). I think that he was justified in so doing, for it seems clear that Pleiston also must belong to a year immediately following that festival.

bership of the Amphiktyonic Council in his archonship seems to require that he be placed between Groups III and IV.

While it is not absolutely proved that the archons of the 'Soteria' group follow in immediate succession, it is probable that such is the case. The growth of the Aitolian vote from five to nine must have taken some time. We date Aristagoras therefore in 260/59 and Emmenidas in 259/8. Kleondas probably belongs in 257/6.

The Lakedaimonian vote at the Council in Kallikles' year is interesting. That Aitolia and Sparta were friendly in 259/8 is shown by the decree in honor of Areus II, but why no representatives came to the Council save in Kallikles' archonship remains a mystery.¹

Group IV is interesting in that we find the Chians represented at the Council for the first time. Dion is the first of this series as Pomtow has recently shown.² Amyntas and Nikaidas are not to be separated and follow in the order named. Since the senators in the archonships of Ameinias and Amyntas are identical, it is probable that Amyntas was archon *suffectus* and finished out the year of Ameinias. A similar situation is found in the case of Aristion and Archelas.³ We therefore date Ameinias in 253/2, Amyntas in 252/1 and Nikaidas in 251/0. From Praochos' archonship we have two Amphiktyonic decrees preserved, in one of which the Boiotian delegates are found but not in the other. Praochos is to be dated in 250/49.

We believe that the archons in Groups I-IV may now be regarded as dated with reasonable certainty. The names of many other archons of this period are found in decrees of the

¹ If Pomtow is correct in his theory that there was some form of rotation by which the Dorian states elected representatives for the Council, we might find the explanation there. It should be noted however that his theory does not work out in practice. Thus in the archonships of Charixenos and Herakleidas we find Argos represented in two successive autumnal sessions. It would seem as if Sikyon were also represented in two successive years in 265 and 264, although the change of delegate in the fall session of 264 may be explained on other grounds. Pomtow sets forth his theory in *Klio* 1914, 283 f.

² *Klio* 1914, 288 ff.

³ The clearest case is in the archonships of Herakleidas and Archiadas where the succession of the two archons is undoubtedly. Cf. Colin, *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2. 90, Bourguet, *ibid.* III 1. 300.

Delphian state. A few of these can be dated within fairly narrow limits on historical grounds, but in most cases we are compelled to rely solely on prosopographical evidence, which, unfortunately, allows a very wide latitude in dating. In a small community like Delphi we find many names recurring generation after generation, very much as we find Sandy MacDonald handed on in some Scottish hamlet. Supposing the Delphic senator became eligible for office at thirty, he might easily have an active public life of forty years more. By that time his grandson might be eligible for election, and in the third century we have no means of telling which is which. It can readily be seen that prosopographical evidence alone helps us but little. Our observations in the following paragraphs when based on this evidence by itself should therefore not be regarded as definitely settling the date of those archons.

A decree in Ariston's year confers honors upon Hieronymos, an Athenian whom Pomtow identifies as the hieromnemon in Straton's year.¹ If he is correct in this identification, it is probable that Ariston immediately follows Straton and Pomtow has correctly restored this archon's name in the decree published by him in *Klio* 1914, p. 285.

In the archonship of Androtimos honors were granted to a citizen of Histiaia. This state had representatives at the Amphiktyonic Council in 260/59 and 259/8. While it does not necessarily follow, yet it is probable that friendly relations between Aitolia and Histiaia were established at this time and that Androtimos should be dated ca. 260. The only vacancy is 261/0 and there he probably belongs. Pomtow has bracketed Androtimos and Achaimenes together, but the evidence for this seems as yet to be unpublished. If such evidence exists, then both archons must go in a different period—possibly ca. Group VI.

Aristion and Archelas belong together, one of them apparently completing the term of the other as archon *suffectus*. The political significance of their honorary decrees helps but little. Makedon and Aitolia were on friendly terms, for an Athenian was honored. The prosopographic evidence favors, if anything, a date before the Chremonidean War.²

¹ GGA 1913, 162 f.

² The fact that Aigina sent a hieromnemon to the Council in the archonship of Archelas (*Fouilles de Delphes*, III 1. 195) is significant.

Aiakidas was senator ca. 282 and Deinon is found in 293–263. These archons probably belong ca. 271–268.

There is wide divergence of opinion in regard to the date of Diodoros. Walek gives his limits as 246–240. Pomtow places him ca. 240/39 and Colin in 280–270. The honorary decrees indicate that the political situation was about the same as in Aristion's year. The prosopographical evidence is not against Colin's date and we are inclined to place this archon ca. 271.

Iatadas and Philon probably belong to this general period. The prosopographic evidence for the latter might place him in the second decade of the century. Peithagoras was senator ca. 310, and the name does not reappear until his archonship ca. 230. Aristion, Theoteles, and Herakleidas are names which occur frequently in the first half of the century, but disappear in the second half.

We are inclined to believe that Theoteles should antedate the period of Aitolian domination, in spite of the fact that an Aitolian receives the honors of the state. The senator Xenostratos is found ca. 307/6. It should be noted that the name Etymondas is very common in the fourth century, but is never found in political activities under Aitolian domination until we come to the very end of the third century. It is possible that we have in this case a Delphic family that was politically out of sympathy with the Aitolian régime and took no part in Delphian public life for that reason. A detailed comparison of the prosopography of the fourth and third centuries might yield some interesting results in this connection. The fourth senator's name is read by Bourguet as Age(as), but it may be restored as Age(las) who was also senator in 285 or Age(tor) who appears in Archelas' year.

Orestas undoubtedly belongs to the early part of the century because of a *stoichedon* inscription which dates from his archonship.¹ Prosopographic evidence lacks definiteness. Lykinos is found in 292 and 262; Menandros in 269 and 264; Kriton in

Aigina must have been independent and we are inclined to date that decree in the latter part of the century, possibly ca. 228 or immediately before Aigina joined the Achaian League. Another alternative is to date the document in the latter part of the fourth century prior to Makedonian domination.

¹ Bourguet, *Fouilles de Delphes III* 1. 135.

289, 267, 264, and in archonships of Thessalos and Euthyon. Lysidamos appears only in 285 and Aristoxenos in 294 and 281. Orestas is probably not to be placed later than ca. 286.

Bourguet and Pomtow agree in transferring the senators Echemmas, Kraton, Philondas, Ison, and Alkineidas from Xenochares II to Xenochares I. (Bourguet denies the existence of No. II.) It is probable that we should therefore transfer Timokrates II to this neighborhood because of the unusual name Echemmas which appears in both archonships. It may be quite possible that we should eliminate Timokrates II. If not, No. II belongs ca. 275.

The internal evidence for the dates of Xenokles, Ainesilas, and Kleu(timos) is very slight. The prosopographic evidence favors a period where all three can be grouped in reasonable proximity to one another. Praochos is found as senator ca. 293 and as archon in 250. Menes is found in 268 and it is possible that this name should be restored as the third senator in Kleu(timos') year. Since there is little room for these archons in the middle of the century, we prefer to place them in the vacant years of the seventies.

Onymokles and Herakleidas III antedate the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens as is shown by the demes and tribes of the Athenians honored in their archonships.¹ Colin dates Onymokles between 262 and 240. The prosopographical evidence favors a place near the upper limit, if we assume that Sogenes, the Delphian *proxenos*, is the grandfather of Sogenes recorded in IG II 403. If the two are identical, Onymokles must belong ca. 240. Herakleidas III must be prior to 245 because of the honorary decree for a Boiotian which was passed in this archonship.²

Aischriondas and Archidamos apparently belong about the middle of the century. Achaimenes is difficult to place by

¹ GGA 1913, 162 f.; Fouilles de Delphes III 2, No. 74.

² Pomtow bases much of his argument for his date of Herakleidas III on palaeography (Klio 1914, 315 f.). This kind of evidence must be handled with great caution, and, since Bourguet is willing to date the decree of Hypatodoros nearly half a century higher, we are not disposed to lay too much stress on the character of the letter-forms as a means of dating, especially when Pomtow himself is uncertain whether the decree of Neon, which he ascribes to Herakleidas III, may not equally well belong to the Herakleidas of ca. 292-280 (*ibid.* p. 320).

prosopographical evidence. The honors conferred on a Messenian in his year may possibly tend to bring this archon ca. 240 about which time Aitolia and Messene became allied (Syll.² 234; cf. Tarn, op. cit. 403 n.).

Some of the prosopographic evidence tends to throw Xenochares in relation to the senatorial groups of the forties. Possibly he and Boulon (?) should exchange places. Lyson must post-date the creation of Ptolemais at Athens, and goes to the last quarter of the century. Damochares should probably be placed along with Euthyon in the forties. Damotimos is dated by Pomtow in a year in which the Pythia were held, and, since he cannot go in 238, the only available date is 246 or 242.

We must assume that there were two archons named Nikarchos. One of these must antedate the creation of Ptolemais at Athens, for a citizen of Keiriadai in the tribe Hippothontis was granted an honorary decree in the archonship of Nikarchos.¹ When Ptolemais was created this deme was transferred from Hippothontis to the new tribe and, so far as we know, no part remained in its old tribal affiliations. If this Nikarchos were dated ca. 226 we should have to grant that Ptolemais was not created in the latter part of 233/2, or else that the deme Keiriadai was divided into two parts, of which only one was transferred to Ptolemais. Since neither of these alternatives is acceptable, we prefer to date Nikarchos I ca. 240 and Nikarchos II ca. 222, a year to which an Amphiktyonic decree from his archonship seems to belong. The political situation at Athens from 229 to the end of the century is still very obscure in most points. She sent representatives to the Council for a very short time after she gained her independence, and after 229 her delegates appear there only sporadically. The explanation may be sought in the relations of Athens and Aitolia, though we are loth to believe that active enmity existed in those years when Athens was absent. If such were the case, we should have undoubted proof of the existence of two archons named Nikarchos, for Athens had no representative at the Council in the archonship of Nikarchos II. The decrees of Nikarchos I must antedate the war between Aitolia and Demetrios. The prosopographic evidence is not decisive but does not preclude a date ca. 240.

It is evident from our dating of Onymokles, Herakleidas III, and Nikarchos I that the chronology of the Delphian archons is closely bound up with the question of the date of the establishment of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens. If Pomtow is correct in dating these archons, then Ptolemais could not have been established in 233/2, or else we must assume that the list of demes to be incorporated in that tribe should be revised. On the other hand, if our theory of the date for the creation of Ptolemais is correct, Pomtow's chronology cannot be accepted for the archons dated ca. 232. We think it advisable therefore to restate as briefly as possible our reasons for believing that Ptolemais was created in 233/2.¹

The whole question is intimately bound up with the rotation of the secretary-cycle and the date of the close of the Chremoneidean War. When the war ended and the Nationalist party was replaced by the pro-Makedonian, it is generally agreed that the rotation of the secretary-cycle was broken and the new secretary was elected from the first tribe in the official order, Antigonis, as a mark of honor to the king. In the latter half of the third century the only fixed point in the cycle is 221, when Pandionis held the secretaryship. If we carry the rotation backward on the basis of twelve tribes in the cycle we find that Antigonis would hold the secretaryship in 261/0. If, however, we assume that Ptolemais was created in 233/2 then the secretaryship of Antigonis must belong to 262/1. The converse of this proposition follows with equal certainty, for if we can prove that the Chremoneidean War ended in the early part of 262/1 and that all the officials of the Nationalist party were replaced by friends of Antigonos, the new cycle beginning in that year can be connected with that found in 221 by assuming that Ptolemais was inserted in the cycle in 232.

Philodemos records the fact that Athens fell and the war ended in the archonship of Antipatros "who preceded Arrheneides" ($\delta\pi\rho\delta'App\epsilon\tau\delta\sigma\nu$). Furthermore, from Klearchos to Arrheneides is a period of 39 years and 3 months.² These two entries are unusual in form and Kolbe was the first to interpret them correctly. Antipatros and Arrheneides were archons in the same year, and after three months in office the former either

¹Cf. AJP 1913, 381 ff.

²Mayer, Philologus 1912, 226 ff.

perished in the war or was removed by Antigonos on the capture of the city and the office was held by Arrheneides for the remainder of the year. By inclusive reckoning we date the fall of Athens within the first three months of the year 262/1. The new cycle begins with the archonship of Arrheneides in the fourth month of that year with Antigonis holding the secretaryship. That Philodemos reckoned by the inclusive method is clear from the evidence for Kleanthes' death. By exclusive reckoning that event would have to be dated in 230 or when Kleanthes would be 102 years old, thus contradicting all other evidence which is in accord in granting this philosopher a bare 100 years of life.¹

That Athens must have been independent of Makedon in 232 is clearly indicated, if not definitely proved, by the Delphic Amphiktyonic lists. A delegate from Athens is found in the Athambos-Pleiston group which Pomtow has dated in 236-232, but it is quite impossible that Athens became independent so early. Sacrifices for the royal Makedonian house were offered in Athens in 233, not long before the revolution. Nor can this series be brought down as late as 229, which is the date given by Ferguson for the independence of the city. It is unfortunate that the Delphian excavations have not as yet yielded the evidence which would enable us to date the Athambos-Pleiston group more precisely, but that it cannot be later than 232-228 seems beyond dispute. As a witness of her independence, Athens once more sent her representative to the Council. We shall have to leave to a later paper the problem of determining why she ceased to send a hieromnemon in 228, though she was still independent. The Athenian inscriptions also give clear proof that Athens had come under the control of the independent Nationalists headed by Eurykleides and Mikion before 229. They were undoubtedly the leaders in the revolt, and from their well-known affiliations with Egypt it may be assumed with equal certainty that they had the moral and financial support of Ptolemy. If Athens waited ten years to do honor to her benefactor, her gratitude is much belated and very strange. Undoubtedly the new tribe was created at once and given the

¹ Beloch, Gr. Gesch. III 2. 472.

secretaryship for the following year. Since the sixth tribe held this office in 233, we have a reasonable explanation of the position of Ptolemais as seventh in the official cycle.

The arrangement of prytanies in the Attic decrees from the archonship of Diomedon to the end of the century shows that thirteen tribes were in existence during that period. Much of this evidence rests on restorations and therefore, in itself, cannot be used as conclusive proof, but may be regarded as valuable support for our theory.¹

It should also be noted that in Attic decrees between 260 and 233 mention of the Makedonian kings was generally excised in later times. Since these inscriptions are usually written *stoichedon* we can estimate the length of the excised formula with precision. In those decrees assigned by Ferguson and Kirchner to the reign of Antigonos the formula varied unaccountably from 38 to 60 letters. Under the new arrangement necessitated by inserting Ptolemais in the cycle in 232, the decrees with the longer formula belong to the reign of Demetrios and the shorter to Antigonos.²

Indirect but strongly confirmatory evidence in support of our theory is found in IG II^a 704. The formulas and style of writing in this decree date it in the first half of the century. The secretary comes from Leontis and cannot be placed in Ferguson's cycle before 220, and Kirchner found himself unable to place the document according to any of the existing cycles. When, however, we grant the existence of Ptolemais in 232 we can place the decree in question in 257/6, a date with which all the other evidence is in accord.

This evidence is cumulative in its effect and seems to prove conclusively that Ptolemais held the secretaryship in 232. Athens gained her independence in the latter part of the preceding year and her hieromnemon appears at the Amphiktyonic Council at the earliest opportunity. In so far, therefore, as Delphic chronology depends upon the history of Athens, it must be revised to conform with this theory.

¹ The evidence is cited at length in AJP 1913, 381 ff.

² Cf. IG II^a 775, 776, 780, 790; cf. AJP 1913, 405-407.

PROSOPOGRAPHY OF DELPHIAN ARCHONS, SENATORS, AND
HIEROMNEMONS.¹

- 302 Hierondas.
- 301 Sylochos S. Echekratidas, Astykrates, Agion, Agathon,
Thrasykles.
S. Herakleidas, Aristomachos, So
- 300 Eudokos S. Aristagoras, Lyson, Hieros, Ariston, Pei-
sitheos, Praxeas?
S. Kallikles, Ariston, Dexippos, Argilius.
- 299 Athambos.
- 298 Timon S. Archidamos, Xenon, Nikandros.
- 297 Hippotas.
- 296
- 295 Ison S. Damochares, Damotimos, Astykrates, Dameas,
Adeimantos.
- 294 Lyson S. Boulon, Pythodoros, Eudoros.
S. Melanopos, Thebagoras, Aristoxenos.
- 293 Hieros S. Praochos, (Tim)ogenes, Deinon.
- 292
- 291 Dexippos S. Ison, Dameas, Nikias, Lykinos.
S. Damokrates, Datys, Hierokles, Kleandros,
Damostratos.
- 290
- 289 Xenocharies.
- S. Echemmas, Kraton, Philondas, Ison, Alki-
neidas.
- 288 *Theoteles* S. Xenostratos, Etymondas, Kleon, Age (las).
- 287 Herakleidas S. Athambos, Xenon, Iasimachos, Zakynthos.
S. Kleon, Theugenies, Archiadas, Peisilas.
- 286 *Orestas* S. Menandros, Kriton, Lykinos, Theoteles.
S. Asphaltos, Lysidamos, Aristoxenos,
De(xippos).
- 285 Ornichidas S. Kallikrates, Sylochos, Charixenos, Hip-
parchos, Lysidamos, Agelas.
S. Theu , Nikias, rates.

¹ In the following list we have followed Pomtow's list of archons for the period 302-280, but we are responsible for the names printed in italics in that period. The use of italics in the remainder of the list implies that the date is only approximate.

- 284 *Philon* S. Kraton, Theuteles, Herakleidas, Peithagoras,
Aristion.
- 283 Kleoboulos S. Korinthotimos.
- 282 *Erasippus* S. Charixenos, Aiakidas, Melission.
S. Archelas, Lysidamos, Nikias.
- 281 Aristoxenos S. Kallikrates, Apemantos, Maimalos.
- 280 Dioskouridas S. Kraton, Hipparchos, pheus.
- 279 *Iatadas* S. Deinon, os, Athanion, Eucharidas.
- 278 *Timokrates* S. Echemmas, Arist
- 277
- 276 *Hieron*.
- 275 *Kleu(timos)* S. Praochos, Athanion, M ,
. dros.
- 274 *Ainesilas* S. Xenon, Aristagoras, Theuskopos, Alkamenes,
Chares.
S. Deinon, Amynandros, Ornichidas.
- 273 *Xenokles I* S. Aristomachos, Alkamenes.
- 272 *Kraton* S. Eudokos, Boulon, Aristion.
- 271 *Diodoros* S. Charixenos, Archelas, Echyllos.
S. Aristomachos, Aristokrates, Dameas, Niko-
dorus, Athambos.
- 270 *Aristion* S. Aiakidas, Epikrates, Mantias, Euagoras, Dion.
S. Damon, Andron, Menandros, Kleotimos.
- 269 *Archelas* S. Menandros, Damon, Kleotimos.
S. Kallikles, Nikodoros, Aristomachos.
- 268 Aristagoras S. Pythophanes, Aristeidas, Menes.
S. Charixenos, Theudoridas, Xenon, Euthyr-
retos.
H. Echyllos, Eteokrates.
- 267 Charixenos S. Chares, Timokrates, Kalliphanes, Lyson.
S. Kriton, Aristokrates, Ornichidas, Nikoda-
mos.
H. Larisos, Aristeidas,
- 266 Herakleidas S. Larisos, Damon, Nikodoros, Sakedallos.
S. Straton, Kleuphanes, Athambos, Ainesilas.
H. Agazalos, Amynandros.
- 265 Archiadas S. Ainesilas, Kleuphanes, Ari . . . , Straton?
(Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 100. 300).
S. Aristagoras, Damon, Archidamos, Philondas.
H. Anaxandridas, Nikodamos.

- 264 Eudokos S. Alkamenes, Lyson, Aischriondas, Nikias,
Menandros.
H. Herakleidas, Kriton.
- 263 Straton S. Lyson, Amynandros, Timogenes.
S. Orestas, Hippias, Deinon, Alkinos, Athanion.
H. Athambos, Ameiniyas.
- 262 Ariston S. Herakleidas, Maimalos, Tarantinos, Kleo-
phanes, Kalliphanes.
H. Lyson, Lykinos. (Klio 1914, p. 285.)
- 261 Androtimos S. Kleomantis, Eudokos, Aristion, Niko-
damos.
- 260 Aristagoras S. Straton, Damotimos, Erasippos, Nikoda-
mos, Emmenidas.
S. Damon, Tarantinos, Hieron, Euthydikos,
Hippon.
H. Archiadas, Mantias.
- 259 Emmenidas S. Kallikles, Xenon, Ariston, Archelas.
H. Kleodamos, Aischriondas.
- 258 Nikodamos H. Aristokrates, Andron.
- 257 Kleondas S. Andron, Archiadas, Alexarchos.
H. Boulon, Pyrrhinos.
- 256 *Onymokles* S. Nikaidas, Xenon, Boulon, Phainis.
S. Kleon, Orestas, Straton.
- 255 *Kallikles* S. Aischriondas, Xenon, Amphistratos, Hagnias,
Philomenes (cf. Fouill. III 1. 193).
H. Dexitheos, Herys.
- 254 Dion S. Echekratidas, Xenon, Euippos, Aristagoras.
S. Gorgippes, Glaukon, Euippos, Kleodoros, Patron.
H. Echekratidas, Nikaidas.
- 253 Ameiniyas S. . . . on, Damen(es), . . . es,
(Nik) aios? (Ditt. SIG I⁸ 405, note 2).
S. Timokrates, Athambos, Kallikles, Dexippus.
- 252 Amyntas S. Timokrates, Athambos, Kallikles, Erasippos.
S. Damon, Pason, Hippias, Eucharidas, Thar-
rikon.
H. Nikomachos, Agathon.
- 251 Nikaidas S. Chares, Amphistratos, Chairephanes.
H. Praochos, Kleomantis.
- 250 Praochos H. Herakleidas, Euthydikos, Tarantinos,
Epikratidas.

- 249 *Archidamos* S. Aristagoras, Damon, Athambos.
S. Kleomantis, Pythodoros, Agazalos, Thes-
salos.
- 248 *Aischriondas* S. Timokrates, Damaios, Agion, Hieros.
S. Thrasykles, Xenochares, Hagnias, Hera-
kleidas.
- 247 *Herakleidas* S. Onymokles, Euthyon, Eudoros, Mnason,
Lysimachos.
S. Athambos, Mnasitheos (cf. *Klio* 1914,
318 ff.).
- 246 *Boulon?* S. Pantandros (cf. *GGA* 1913, 166).
- 245 *Euthyon* S. Kleon, Kraton, Pason, Kriton, Kallikrates.
- 244 *Xenochares II* S. (Kleom)antis.
- 243 *Damochares* S. Damon, Damotimos, Kleonymos.
S. Antandros, Erasippos, Euarchidas.
- 242 *Damotimos* S. Pyrrhos, Kleuphanes, Kleinias, Philinos,
Kallikrates.
S. Mimneas, Xenon, Lyson, Archiadas,
Damon.
- 241 *Achaimenes* S. Kleomantis, Andron, Boulon, Pyrrhinos,
Mantias.
S. Iasimachos, Praxias, Emmenidas, Eche-
kratidas, Hippon.
- 240 *Nikarchos I* S. Praxias, Damarchos, Archiadas, Nikan-
dros, Botakos.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

III.—COMIC TERMINATIONS IN ARISTOPHANES.

PART IV.¹

- της

The suffix -της when added to verbal stems makes nouns of agency; when added to the stem of the name of a city, country, or other locality, usually in the form -ι-της, it makes a gentile or ethnic name denoting an inhabitant of the place. The latter use is found in the following words:

Καρκινίτης, Vesp. 1505, for Καρκινίδης the epic equivalent of νιὸς Καρκίνου (1501): 'Carcinite' or 'Carcinian' (cf. Κάρκινα) for 'Carcinus' mighty son'. So Κοδρίτης (adesp. 1044) for Κοδρίδης, and Κρονίτης² for Κρονίδης. Lobeck compares *Icariotis* for *Icaris* Propert. 3, 13, 10, Culex 265, *Oceanitis* for *Oceanis* Verg. Georg. 4, 341.

Πυκνίτης, Eq. 42, was suggested perhaps by the familiar 'Aρεοπαγίτης, since the two hills are not far apart. Δῆμος Πυκνίτης sounds like Πρωταγόρας 'Αβδηρίτης and such expressions. It was on the Pnyx that the general assembly of the people was held, and hence Demus is called a citizen of the Pnyx, like 'Uncle Sam of Capitol Hill'. Compare Στρούθιος, Av. 1077, formed from στρουθός 'sparrow' with the gentile adjective termination -ιος, in order that Φιλοκράτη τὸν Στρούθιον might correspond in sound and appearance to Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον.³ The lines in which the two expressions occur (1072, 1077) are otherwise identical. The same ethnic suffix -ιος is employed in Ὀτοτύχιοι Av. 1042 (made from ὄτοτύχω so as to correspond to 'Ολοφύξιοι 1041), in Κερβέριοι Ran. 187 (from Κέρβερος, to resemble Κιμμέριοι), in 'Αχραδούσιοι Eccl. 362 (ἀχράς, 'Αχερδού-

¹ Previous studies, of which this is a continuation, are Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments. Part I: Diminutives, Character Names, Patronymics (Baltimore, Murphy, 1902); The Termination -άσις, as Used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect, A. J. P. XXXI 428-44; and The Suffix -μα in Aristophanes, A. J. P. XXXVII 459-65.

² See Bekk. Anecd. 22, 31, Poll. 2, 16.

³ Στρούθιον δὲ εἶται ἀς Μήλιον, Schol.

σιος), in Κοπρεῖος Eccl. 317 (*κόπρος*, *Κόπρειος*¹); cf. Κομπασένις Av. 1126 (*κόμπος*) 'Boastonian', Χωλίδης (so van Leeuwen for MS. Χολλίδης) Ach. 406 (*χωλός*, *Χολλείδης*) 'Dicaeopolis of Cripple Creek', Κλωπίδαι Eq. 79 (*κλώψ*, *Κρωπίδαι*).²

Ταρταρίτης (adesp. 1160). "καὶ τὸ κωμικὸν Ταρταρίτης", St. Byz.

Τρυμαλίτης (adesp. 1169) is a comic epithet of Aphrodite made from *τρυμαλιά*³ so as to have the appearance of a gentile name.

-της in Nouns of Agency.

νυστακής Vesp. 12 (cf. Alciphron 3, 46), ἀποστερητής Nub. 730, ἀποστερήτης adesp. 109. These *nomina actoris* take the place of attributive adjectives or participles, and through their suffixes of agency they personify the nouns they limit. In Nub. 730 *γνώμην ἀποστερητίδα* is a 'robber notion': Strepsiades is still one of the uninitiated, and the poet purposely withdraws from the unsophisticated pupil the adjective in -κός which he properly assigns to the philosophic teacher (728). And so in reply to Socrates' ἀποστερητικός Strepsiades is made to use ἀποστερητίδα rather than ἀποστερητικήν. But later when he has evolved a sophistic notion, he employs ἀποστερητικήν (747) without hesitation.⁴ For the use of a *nomen agentis* in place of a participle or adjective, compare *esuritor* 'professional hungryman' in Mart. 3, 14 instead of *esuriens*.

Nouns in -ισταί and -ασταί frequently denote the members of a cult-society or other club or association.⁵ Ηὐθαγοριστής, from πυθαγορίζω⁶ and the suffix of agency -της, is a Pythagorist or Pythagorizer rather than a Pythagorean (Ηὐθαγόρειος). The word was used to ridicule those so-called disciples of the philosopher who imitated merely the outward mode of life of the members of the school, and often exaggerated its peculi-

¹ Cf. Eq. 899, Plaut. M. G. 90.

² Compare in Plautus' Captivi 160-3 *Pistorienses* (*pistor*, *Pistorienses*), *Panicei* (*panis*, *Poenici?*), *Placentini* (*placenta*, *Placentini*), *Turdetani* (*turdus*, *Turdetani*), and *Ficedulenses* (*ficedula*).

³ See Ath. 621 a for the meaning.

⁴ Cf. A. J. P. XXXI 434.

⁵ See Fraenkel, Gesch. d. griech. Nomina agentis, I, 175 f., 232 f., II, 71 f.

⁶ Antiph. 135, 226, Alex. 220, and in the name of plays of Alexis and Cratinus Minor.

arities. It occurs in the title of a play of Aristophon, also in frgg. 9 and 12, and in Antiph. 160 (conj. Elmsl.). διαφέροντι δὲ Πυθαγορικοὶ τῶν Πυθαγοριστῶν· ὅτι οἱ μὲν Πυθαγορικοὶ πᾶσαν φροντίδα ποιοῦνται τοῦ σώματος, οἱ δὲ Πυθαγορισταὶ περιεσταλμένη καὶ αὐχμηρῷ διαίτῃ χρῶνται.¹ The Πυθαγορικτάς mentioned in Theocr. 14, 5 is “barefoot and wan”, and in Alex. 197 it is said that “he must put up with scant food, filth, cold, silence, and sullenness, and must go without bathing”.

In place of *πωλητής*, the proper form of the noun of agency from *πωλέω* when it is simple and uncompounded, Aristophanes changing the termination with comic intent in Eq. 131, 133, 140 used *πώλης*, the form found in compounds only.² Compare “orthodoxy, heterodoxy and *doxy*”. Shilleto compares -monger in English, and the words “A right monger i’ faith” in Ben Jonson’s Tale of a Tub II, 3. Just the reverse of this, namely, the use of the ending of the simple word in the compound form, may be seen in *λαχανοπωλήτρια* Th. 387 instead of the regular form *λαχανόπωλις*,³ in *συκοφάντρια* Pl. 970 instead of *συκόφαντις*,⁴ and in *κωμῳδοποιήτης* coined chiefly for the sake of the meter in Pac. 734 in place of the usual *κωμῳδοπούς*, cf. *τραγῳδοπούς*.

σκευοφοριώτης, Eupol. 264, for *σκευοφόρος*. The change of ending was made for fun (Pollux). Hemsterhuys first suggested that the termination was borrowed from *εἰραφώτης*, a surname of Dionysus, or, as Meineke⁵ conjectured, the god was addressed in jest as *σκευοφοριώτης*, in place of his solemn name *εἰραφώτης*, cf. fr. 256.

τρισμακαρίτης Antiph. 168. *μακαρίτης* is substituted for *μακάριος*⁶ in Pl. 555, because the poor man’s life has so little pleasure in it that it is no life at all. But in Antiph. 168 there

¹ Schol. Theocr. 14, 5, and Suid.

² See Nicophon 19, Poll. 7, 196–9.

³ Vesp. 497, Lys. 457, and scholl. Ach. 457, 469, Eq. 19, Th. 910, Ran. 840.

⁴ Cf. *ἱερόφαντις* Plut. Sulla 13, schol. Soph. O. C. 681, C. I. G. 432, 434, 435, and *πρόφαντις* Trag. Graec. Frag. adesp. 425 N².

⁵ Frag. Com. Graec. I, 144 f., II, 530.

⁶ *μακαρίτης* δὲ τεθνέως, *μακάριος* δὲ ξῶν, schol. Aesch. Pers. 636, cf. schol. Ar. Pl. 555, Suid., and Ar. fr. 488.

is a shift of termination rather than a change of words, when the ending of *τρισμακάρος* is changed for fun to *-ίης*, thus making the new and absurd formation *τρισμακαρίης*.

Varia.

συγκαλυμμός (*οὐγκαλυμμός* Dawes) Av. 1496 for *συγκάλυμμα* (*έγκαλυμμα*), 'envelopage' for 'envelopment'. Compare *κάλυμμα*, *παρα-*, *περι-*, *κατα-*, *ἐκ-*, *ἀπο-*, *συ-*, *ἐπι-*, *προ-κάλυμμα*, whereas forms in *-μός* from this stem do not occur.

βάδος Av. 42 in place of *βάδωσις*. ἐν παιδιῷ παρεσχημάτισται, says the scholiast (cf. Eust. 637, 6). With *βάδον* βαδίζομεν compare *κράγον κεκράξεται*, Eq. 487. οἱ κωμικοὶ παίζειν εἰώθασι τὰ τουαῦτα (schol.).

φροντιστήριον Nub. 94, 128, 142, 181, 1144, 1487, 'thinkery', 'thinkshop', comically formed by Aristophanes from *φροντίζειν* on the analogy of *δικαστήριον*, *βουλευτήριον*, κ. τ. λ. by adding *-τήριον*, the usual suffix denoting place, to the verbal stem. Some writers think that *φροντιστής* too is very likely a coinage of Aristophanes.

ἴπτερος Nub. 74. This comic invention gets its ending from *ἴκτερος* which it suggests. Formed on the analogy of *ἴκτερος* and *ὑδερός*, words which denote disease, it is intended to mean 'horse-sickness' (*νόσος ιππική* 243). Compare the free use of *-itis* in newly coined words like literaturitis, Americanitis.

χαρηδών Ach. 4. Many words in *-δών* (cf. *-do*, *-dinus* in Latin) signify a diseased condition of body or mind, physical or mental suffering,¹ e. g., *τηκεδών*, *σπαδών*, *σηρεδών*, *πυθεδών*, *τυφεδών*, *πρηδών*, *έδηδών*, *ἀκιηδών*, *στρεγυεδών*, *τερηδών*, *μεληδών*, *ἀχθηδών*, *ἀλγηδών*. On the analogy of these words, but especially *ἀλγηδών*, *ἀχθηδών*, *μεληδών*, and *συναλγηδών*, Aristophanes coined the incongruous word *χαρηδών*, expressing not mental anguish but gladness, 'joyitis' perhaps. It takes the place of *χαρά* here (Hesych.)—'rejoicement' or 'rejoicefulness' instead of 'rejoicing'—and has a high sound.

Νεφελοκοκκυίαι, Av. 917, 963, 1023, the plural in place of the usual singular form of the name (vss. 819, 821, 904, 1565) on the analogy of cities with plural names, 'Αθῆναι its mother-country, in particular, as if this newly built city forsooth were

¹ Brugmann, Grundriss² II, 1, §§ 363, 501.

like Athens the result of the union of a dozen states. The three adventurers from Athens who use this form seek thus to ingratiate themselves with Peithetaerus, since the plural in place of the singular gives the city an air of greater importance.

πάτρα Alexis 193. The poetic *πάτρα*¹ is here used in place of the familiar prose word *πατρίς*, in order that *πάτρας* may make a jingle with *μήτρας* in the following line; just as the coined word *ἰχθυοπώλαινα* was substituted by Pherecrates in fr. 64 for *ἰχθυόπωλις*, the correct form of the feminine, in order to make a jingle with *μαγείραινα*.² In the same way Plautus put *inaniae* in place of *inanitas*³ in Aul. 84 for the sake of the rhyme *inaniis—araneis*.

πλέκος in the paratragic passages Ach. 454, Pac. 528 stands for *πλέγμα*, just as *πρᾶγος* is used in poetry for *πρᾶγμα*. It is found nowhere else, and for that reason may possibly be a comic invention here. In Pac. 528 it takes the place of *τέκος* in the line from the Telephus there parodied, and it is evident that it was used in preference to *πλέγμα* on account of the similarity of sound of *πλέκος* and *τέκος*. Still closer to *τέκος* is *τέγος* in the parody of the same line by Plato Comicus (fr. 135). Starkie suggests that *πλέκος* may be a substitute for *τέκος* in Ach. 454 also. In this line (Ach. 454), furthermore, *χρέος* is used for *χρεία*, perhaps for fun. Another formation of the kind, perhaps comic, is *βλέπος* in Nub. 1176 for *βλέμμα* (Pac. 239, Pl. 367, 1022). It occurs only here.

ἀλμαῖα Ar. fr. 419 for *ἄλμη*, and *πυγαῖα* Archipp. 41 (cf. Mein. 2, 726) for *πυγή* remind one of the poetic *γαῖα* in place of the prose word *γῆ*, *εὐναῖα* for *εὐνή*, *ἀναγκαῖ* for *ἀνάγκη*, *γαληναῖη* for *γαλήνη*, *Ἄθηναῖ* and *Ἀθηναῖα* for *Ἀθηνᾶ*, *Σεληναῖη* for *Σελήνη*, κ. τ. λ. See Anecd. Bekk. 22, 28: *ἀλμαίαν*, *τὴν ἄλμην* ὡς *Ἄθηνᾶ* *Ἀθηναία*, *πύλη πυλαῖα*, *ῶρα ωραῖα*, cf. 73, 31. These longer and fuller poetic forms—often the same as the feminine of the adjective in *-αος*—have a dignified and lofty tone, but when used instead of vulgar and commonplace words like *πυγή*, they are ridiculous.

¹ For *πάτρα* in paratragic passages, cf. Th. 136, Ran. 1163, 1427.

² Cf. Comic Terminations, Part I, pp. 15 f.

³ The reverse change, i. e. from *opulentia* to *opulentitas*, in M. G. 1171 produces a grandiose effect, just as Cicero's coinages *Appietas* and *Lentulitas* (Fam. 3, 7, 5) do.

βολβοῖο Plat. Com. 173 for *βολβοῦ*. As a parody on the proverb

ἀρξομαι ἐξ ἀγαθοῖο, τελευτήσω δ' ἐπ' ἄμεινον,

Plato the comic poet wrote the line

ἀρξομαι ἐκ βολβοῖο, τελευτήσω δ' ἐπὶ θύννον.

Eustathius (on Il. 18, 570), however, seems to think that this Plato passage points back to Homer's words *ἐν σοὶ μὲν λίγιω, σέο δ' ἀρξομαι* in Il. 9, 97. The mention of Philoxenus' pretentious work on cookery (*Δεῖπνον*) which was written in an extraordinary style and in Homeric verse causes the speaker to fall into the dactylic hexameter and to attach the lofty epic ending of the genitive case to the lowly word *βολβός*, by way of imitation and ridicule. This incongruity is in accord with the contrast between the triviality and indecency of the matters discussed in the fragment, and the heroic verse in which they are clothed. The same incongruity is created when the iterative suffix *-σκ-* which is Ionic and epic¹ is added to the vulgar word *βινέω* in the mock-tragic line Eq. 1242.

Στρεψιάδες Nub. 1206 is a blunder of the rustic Strepsiades in the inflection of his own name, caused by a false analogy with vocatives like *Σώκρατες* which he himself employed in vs. 222. It is used in place of *Στρεψιάδη* for fun, say the scholiast, Choeroboscus I, 164, 20 (Hilg.), and Cramer. Anecd. Ox. III, 390. See also *Ηράκλειδες* (?) in Menand. 893.

ἔμαντρος Plat. Com. 78. In the opinion of Apollonius, De Pron. 69, 18 and 113, 17, the nominative case of the reflexive *ἔμαντρον* was probably used *ἐνεκα τοῦ γελοίου*. See Pherecr. 112.

τάχας Ar. fr. 869 is thought to be the comically formed accusative plural of the adverb *τάχα* 'perhaps', the excessive use of which the poet is ridiculing.

Comic Feminines.

In view of the seclusion of women in ancient Athens, feminines of words like general, herald, policeman, and orator are comic. The gender is indicated by the article in *ἡ γραμματεύς* Th. 432, *ἡ στρατηγός* Eccl. 491, 500, 727 (see also fr. 945), Cratin. 428; but in the following words it is shown by the termination, which thus contributes to the comic effect:

¹ See Curt. Stud. I, 2, 259, Curtius, Verb.¹ II, 376 f.

στρατηγίς Eccl. 835, 870, ‘commandress’, ‘chieftainess’, comes appropriately from the mouth of the female herald and of one who has been converted to the new order of things in the Ecclesiazusae. See also Pherecr. 235.

Στρατιώτιδες ‘Soldier Girls’ is the name of a play of the comic poet Theopompus; cf. ‘sailor girls’ (*ναυτίδες, ναύτραι¹*) in Theopompus and Aristophanes. As adjectives, *στρατηγίς* and *στρατιώτις* are familiar.

Χορηγίς, a play of Alexis, deserves mention here only in case it is a female choregus, not the name of a hetaera.

κηρύκαινα Eccl. 713, ‘heraldess’, ‘crieress’, is another product of the *γυναικοκρατία*. Cf. *σκύλαξ, σκυλάκαινα* for the form.

Σκύθαινα, Lys. 184, a comic feminine of *Σκύθης* (=τοξότης) in the sense of ‘policeman’ (Th. 1017, 1026, etc.), and hence a ‘policewoman’. See also Alex. 331. The form too is unusual, the regular feminine being *Σκυθίς*. It is made on the analogy of words like *Δάκων, Δάκαινα*.

μαγείραινα Pherecr. 64 is comic in form as well as in meaning: οὐδὲς οὐδὲ μαγείραιναν εἰδε πάποτε, | ἀλλ' οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἰχθυοπώλαιναν. *Θεράπαινα* may have suggested *μαγείραινα*. *ἰχθυοπώλαινα* in the second line is another comic formation, made to rhyme with *μαγείραινα*. See above, p. 177.

συκοφάντρια Pl. 970 ‘informeress’. Like the *συκοφάντης* who was a prominent figure in the long preceding scene, the old woman too had suffered reverses through the healing of Plutus’ blindness, and since she entered just as he ran off, it was natural to call her in fun a ‘she-informer’. That the occupation was unheard-of for women makes the term all the more ridiculous. For the unusual form see above, p. 175.

συκάστρια adesp. 1158. *συκαστάι*=*συκοφάνται*, E. M. *συκάστρια*=*συκοφάντρια*, Hesych. Cf. *σοφίστρια*, ‘a she-sophist’, coined by Plato, Euthyd. 297 c.

Αθηναία Pherecr. 34. The familiar formula “Athenians and their allies” is parodied by being put in the feminine. In order that, for the purposes of parody, the change may be as slight as possible, merely the ending of *Αθηναῖος* is made feminine, though the usual feminine is *Αττική*. *Αθηναία* also

¹ Theopompus’ *ναυτίδες* (fr. 79) is a more correct formation than Aristophanes’ *ναύτραι* (fr. 825), cf. *κλέπτρια* (Sotad. 2).

implies citizenship. See *Mnem.* X, 82 and *Hermes* XLII, 11 for this passage, and compare *Philem.* 66 and *Canthar.* 5.

Protagoras divided substantives into three classes as to gender, masculines, feminines, and things,¹ and criticised the gender of *μῆνις* and *πτήσης* in Homer, holding that they should have been masculine,² perhaps on account of the termination.³ It is these grammatical views of Protagoras, set forth in his treatise on *όρθοσέπεια*, that Aristophanes brings into ridicule in Nub. 658–693,⁴ attributing them, of course, to Socrates who is made the representative of the class of sophists. He coins *ἀλεκτρύαινα* 'cockess' on the analogy of *λέων*, *λέαινα*, 'lion', 'lioness', in order to show the gender plainly, since the usual word *ἀλεκτρύων* must stand for both male and female. This leads him to the unexpected change of *ἡ κάρδοπος* to *ἡ καρδόπη* that termination and gender may agree, seeing that *-ος* is in most cases a masculine suffix; and then he proceeds with equal abruptness to change *Κλεώνυμος* to *Κλεωνύμη*, just as he changed *Σμίκυθος* to *Σμικύθη* in the Knights 969, in order to ridicule the effeminacy and womanish habits of these men, the same purpose being accomplished by the article in *τὴν Ἀμυνίαν* Nub. 691. Compare *Egilia* for *Egilus* in Cic. *De Orat.* 2, 277; *Pediatia* for *Pediatius* in Hor. *Sat.* 1, 8, 39; and Freinsheim's conjecture *Gaiam Caesarem* in Tac. *Ann.* 6, 5; and for a change of the opposite kind, the substitution of *Ὑψικράτης* for *Ὑψικρατία*, see Plut. *Pomp.* 32, 6.

Three instances of this last change, in which the masculine ending is substituted for the feminine in words that are properly feminine, may be noted here. The comic effect is not great, but is worthy of mention.

Λυσίστρατος Lys. 1105. The shift of termination is comic in so far as it gives an opportunity to play on the inner meaning of the word (*λύειν* + *στρατόν*).

σάλπης Archipp. 19. In the war waged by the fish upon men, the *σάλπη* assumes the form *σάλπης* in order to become the trumpeter (*σαλπ-ίζω*).

¹ Aristot. *Rhet.* III, 5, 5.

² Id. *Soph. Elench.* ch. 14.

³ Id. *Poet.* ch. 21 fin.

⁴ Cf. Spengel, *Artium Script.* 42–3; Frei, *Quaest. Protag.* 130–3; Zeller, *Phil. d. Griech.* I, 1018, 5.

μητριός Theopomp. Com. 12. The Greek word for 'step-father' is πατρώς or πατρύς,¹ but Theopompus in sport coined a word for 'step-father' by merely changing the ending of μητριά 'step-mother' from feminine to masculine.

Comic Comparatives and Superlatives.

A comic effect is produced when words are compared which do not admit of comparison:

αὐτόρεpos αὐτῶν, Epicharm. fr. 5 K.

αὐτόταros Ar. Pl. 83. In a similar conversation in the Trinummus Plautus made up *ipsissimumus*² (988) in imitation of αὐτόταros.³

Δαναώταros Ar. fr. 259. This is one of the forms that comedy coined ἐνέκα γελοίον, seeing that proper names are not compared, says Apollonius, De Pron. 64, 10. Cf. *Poenior* in Plaut. Poen. 991:

Nullus me est hodie Poenus Poenior.

προβάτεpos, οιότεpos Sophron 122 K, 96 Ahr. These words come from the text of Ahrens whose reading of an obscure passage in E. M. 256, 33 is προβάτου προβάτερον, οἷος οιότερον. They are regarded as comic comparatives of πρόβατον and δῆs.

κραμβόταros Eq. 539. Some scholars follow Hesychius in his explanation of this word as equivalent to καπυρώταros (cf. Theocr. 7, 37); others, notably Professors Gildersleeve and Wilamowitz, regard it as a comic superlative of κράμβη 'cabbage'. Crates' jokes were stale, 'chestnuts' done up in a slightly new form. With the latter meaning of κραμβόταros compare such newspaper English as "T. is the whiskiest town I ever saw".

¹ See Plut. Arat. 41, 2, Cleom. 11, 1, C. I. G. 3445, Eustath. on Il. 5, 385.

² Ergo vides quae nomina comparantur: quae sunt qualitatis et quantitatis. Ea autem, quae non sunt qualitatis et quantitatis, non recipiunt comparationem. Ne te decipient illa Plautina et Afraniana verba, ipsissimus; ioco comico hoc dixit. Est etiam apud Graecos αὐτόταros tale. Comica sunt ista et ad artem non pertinent. Pompeius, Comment. 153, 13 (Keil).

³ Compare also *die deinigste* in Jean Paul, Titan 73: "Aber, Bruder, kannst du nur eine Minute lang glauben, sie bleibe nicht ewig die deinigste?" and Franz Liszt's "Komme zu deinem deinsten F. L." (quoted by Schwab).

μονώταρος Eq. 352, Pl. 182, 'onliest'. ὡς αὐτόταρος πέπακται is the comment of the scholiast. Yet it occurs in Lycurg. 88 and 89, and Theocr. 15, 137, and so was less extraordinary than *αὐτόταρος*.

προτεράίτερος Eq. 1165. This comic doubling of the comparative is appropriately assigned to the vulgar Sausage-seller, who was responsible for *μονώταρος* (352) too. He answers the Paphlagonian's *πρότερος* with a double comparative in order to outdo him.

κύντερώτερος,¹ Pherecr. 106, a comparative of the comparative *κύντερος* (Homer).

κύντατώτατος Eubul. 85, formed from *κύντατος* (Hom., Eur., Ap. Rh.), and hence a double superlative.

Double forms, however, are by no means confined to comedy, cf. Aesch. fr. 432, 434 N²., and the examples given in Kühner-Blass, § 157, 4. In Latin they belong mainly to the later language, e. g., *postremissimus*, *minimissimus*, *proximior*, *pluriores*. Such doubling as *μᾶλλον ὀλβιώτερος*² Eccl. 1131 is more in accord with the usage of other Greek authors. Another kind of pleonasm which likewise occurs elsewhere is seen in *ὑποπρεσβύτεραι* Ar. fr. 350, *ὑποθηλύτερος* and *ὑπαγροικότερος* fr. 685, where both the prefix *ὑπο-* and the comparative ending express the idea of 'somewhat'.

One may notice in passing the heaping together of a number of superlatives. The longer and more sonorous the adjective, the droller the effect. It is often in address that they are thus crowded together. See, for example, *σοφώτατε*, *κλεινότατε*, *σοφώτατε*, *γλαφυρώτατε* Av. 1271 f., *φιλανθρωπότατε*, *μεγαλοδωρότατε* Pac. 393 f., *φιλτάτη*, *μισοπορτακιστάτη* Pac. 661 f., *θερμόταται*, *ποτίσταται* Th. 735, *χειροτεχνικωτάτους*, *σοφώτατον*, *κιθαραιδότατον*, *θυμοσοφικώτατον* Vesp. 1276 ff.

In Plautus comic superlatives abound, e. g., *verberabilissimus* Aul. 633, *paenissime* Aul. 466, 668, Most. 656, *ecfertissimus* Capt. 775, *occisissimus* Cas. 694, *penitissimus* Cist. 63, Pers. 522, 541, *oculissimus* Curc. 120, *parissimus* Curc. 506,

¹ For other variations from the norm in Pherecrates see *κλεπτίδης* (Comic Termin., Part I, p. 52), *ἰχθυοπάλαινα*, *μαγείραινα*, and 'Αθηναῖα (above), and Meineke, Hist. Crit. Com. Graec. pp. 67 f.

² *Magis* with a comparative is a colloquialism that is rather common in Plautus.

exclusissimus Men. 698, *geminissimus* Pers. 830, *patruissimus* Poen. 1197.

-ίστερος and -ίστατος.

Comparatives and superlatives in -ίστερος and -ίστατος are found chiefly in comedy. Xenophon has πλεονεκτίστατος and δύοφαγίστατος, and Aristotle λαλίστερος and λαγνίστατος—not high words. In Euripides' satyr-drama, the Cyclops, old Silenus uses λαλίστατος in speaking to the monster, but this is not far from comedy. The rest are in the comic poets. In these more or less vulgar endings -ίστερος and -ίστατος lies the comic force of the following comparatives and superlatives, that is to say, the form of the words rather than their meaning is comic:

κλεπτίστατος¹ Pl. 27, a surprise after πιστότατος; ποτίστατος Th. 735; πτωχίστερος Ach. 425 (elsewhere πτωχότερος); λαλίστερος Ran. 91, fr. 668, Alex. 92, Menand. 416; λαλίστατος² Menand. 164; κακηγορίστερος Pherecr. 96; κακηγορίστατος Elephant. 5; μυοφαγίστατος Vesp. 923 (comic in meaning as well as in form); μισοπορπακίστατος Pac. 662; ἀρπαγίστατος Plat. Com. 57; γαστρίστερος Plat. Com. 195.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

¹ Cf. κλεπτίστερος, Suidas, in the proverb Νεοκλεῖ... κλεπτή τερος.

² Plut. Quaest. Conviv. 1, 5, 1; Luc. Somn. 2.

IV.—THE TO- PARTICIPLE WITH THE ACCUSATIVE IN LATIN.

Although this subject has been discussed by so many eminent authorities, none of the explanations of the origin of the construction can be regarded as final and an attempt to discuss it from a different point of view and in reference to a larger number of examples hardly requires an apology. The theories put forward hitherto fall broadly into three classes: Some grammarians regard the construction as a pure Hellenism and explain the accusative as identical with and apparently due to the accusative with adjectives, as *nudus pedem*, etc., in Latin poetry; others suggest that the accusative is retained from the active construction, the dative instead of the accusative becoming the subject in this peculiar passive idiom; lastly there are those who regard the *tus*-form as middle with the various meanings found in Greek and the accusative as the direct object. Presumably most supporters of the passive explanations would, like Bennett (*Syntax of Early Latin* ii, p. 25) agree that *uestem indutus* and similar examples have an active or middle sense; yet all the rest they consider passive and make the common error of assuming that the theory which they have formulated or to which they have given their sanction must somehow fit all instances. This perhaps has arisen from an error to which syntax at its present stage of development is particularly prone, viz., theorising from insufficient data. Brugmann (*Indogerm. Forschungen* 27, p. 121 ff., and *Grundriss*² II. 2, 168 ff.) alone has taken a broader view of the subject and in his recognition of the influence of the construction *uestem indutus* has anticipated in some respects my explanation; but his paper deals only with the so-called ‘Akkusativ der Beziehung’, and he does not therefore trace the idiom through its various stages. No one seems hitherto to have estimated in this construction the working of analogy, which is a potent force in all language and especially in that of poetry, which purposely seeks to avoid the commonplace.

A collection of examples of the *to*-participles with the accusative from Vergil, with whom the construction was a special favourite, reveals the fact that in a very large number of instances the construction must have an *active* sense and the poet could have desired to convey no other meaning. Among these we may cite: Aen. I. 228 *illum talis iactantem pectore curas | lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentis | adloquitur Venus*; ib. I. 480 *crinibus Iliades passis peplum ... ferebant | suppliciter, tristes et tunsa pectora palmis*; ib. I. 561 *tum breuiter Dido uoltum demissa profatur*; ib. IV. 589 *terque quaterque manu pectus percussa decorum | flauentisque abscissa comas*; ib. VII. 503 *Siluia prima soror palmis percussa lacertos | auxilium uocat*; ib. VII. 806 (aduenit Camilla) *| bellatrix non illa colo calathisue Mineruae | femineas adsueta manus, sed proelia virgo | dura pati*; ib. XI. 121 *conuersique oculos inter se atque ora tenebant*; ib. XI. 479 *iuxtaque comes Lauinia uirgo oculos deicta decoros*; ib. XI. 50; *oculos horrenda in uirgine fixus*; ib. XI. 877 *percussae pectora matres | femineum clamorem ad caeli sidera tollunt*; ib. XII. 65 *acepit uocem lacrimis Lauinia matris | flagrantis perfusa genas*; ib. XII. 172 *illi ad surgentem conuersi lumina solem | dant fruges*; ib. XII. 605 *filia prima manu floros Lauinia crinis | et roseas laniata genas, tum cetera circum | turba furit* (notice in this example *manu*, which brings out the active force of the expression); Buc. VI. 53 *ille latus niueum molli fultus hyacintho | ilice sub nigra pallentis ruminat herbas*. It is quite impossible in consideration of the meaning to construe any of these instances as passive; the accusative, which in the examples quoted to this point denotes a 'part of the body,' is the direct object of the participle. Similarly we find the 'accusative of the garment' as the direct object of the participle: Aen. VII. 667 *ipse pedes, tegimen torquens immane leonis, | terribili impexum saeta cum dentibus albis | indutus capiti, sic regia tecta subibat*; ib. XI. 487 *rutilum thoraca indutus aenis | horrebat squamis*; ib. IV. 136 *tandem progreditur magna stipante caterua | Sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdata limbo*. There are many other instances of the *to*-participle with a transitive force followed by the acc. in Vergil, which we shall see below are to be considered in connexion with these. On the other hand

we find instances in the poets in which the force of the participle is clearly passive, as Verg. Aen. II. 57 *Ecce, manus iuuenem interea post terga reuinctum | pastores, magno ad regem clamore trahebant*; ib. II. 273 (Hector) *aterque cruento | puluere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis*; ib. Georg. IV. 371 et gemina *auratus taurino cornua uoltu | Eridanus*; Hor. Epode IV. 3 Hibericis *peruste funibus latus | et crura dura compede*. In these examples, which have purposely been quoted in full with their context, the force of the participle is quite clear. Other instances, which are more obscure or due to the influence of analogy, will be considered later, after the origin of the construction in the simpler types has been discussed.

As is well known now, the *to*-suffix was originally quite unconnected with voice, tense or any other verbal peculiarity. In Indo-European it was added not only to verbals but also to substantives to form adjectives, where it came to mean 'in possession of', as Skr. *añkūritāḥ* (from *añkurah*) 'furnished with shoots', Grk. *θυσανωτός* (from *θύσανος*); Lat. *barbātus* (from *barba*), *cornūtus*, etc. When added to verbal stems it denotes similarly that the person or thing represented by the substantive has come into a certain condition or is enduring certain circumstances as the result of doing or suffering the action expressed by the verb. The suffix *-to-* is thus quite unconnected with voice in its origin and used with both transitive and intransitive verbs, as may be seen from the following examples: Skr. *śratāḥ* 'heard, famous', Grk. *κλυτός*, Lat. *inclusus*; Skr. *āgataḥ* 'coming (to)', Grk. *βαρός*, Lat. *circumuentus*; Skr. *sthitāḥ*, Grk. *στατός*, Lat. *status*, originally connected with the verb *stare* and meaning 'having come to a stand' and then 'standing'. (For further examples see Brugmann, Grundriss² II. I, p. 394 ff.) Now in the Indo-European languages the participles are used also as pure adjectives. This caused the *to*-adjective to become a participle in Italic and Sanskrit (see also Brugmann, Indogerm. Forschungen V. 89 ff.). The original meaning of the suffix from its occurrence in certain contexts was very easily narrowed and specialised for the expression of the past participle middle and passive. In Vedic Sanskrit it exists as synonymous with other forms of the perfect participle, as *gatāḥ* and *jaganvāḥ* 'having gone'; *grasitāḥ* and

jagrasānāh ‘devoured’; in Italic it has replaced any other forms of the medial-passive participle which may have existed and has also come to be used with the verb ‘to be’ to form a compound tense. Though the usual force of the *tus*-participle in Latin is perfect passive there are also examples of its use in an active sense, especially in the so-called deponent verbs, as *ratus*, *confisus*, *diffisus*, etc. Doubtless in prehistoric Italic they had acquired a middle force, since they are connected with the medial-passive conjugation. Perhaps we may see a middle or active force still in the adverbs ending in *-uersus*, *-uorsus* (originally derived from *uerto*), as non *prōrsus* cedit (Plaut.) ‘(while) not turning (himself) forward he advances’; quis hic est, qui *aduorsus* it mihi? (Plaut.) ‘who is this, who comes turning to me?’; *aduersum legem accepisti . . . pecuniam* (Plaut.) ‘You received money—an action which contravenes the law’. Of course, to the Roman these were stereotyped adverbs and prepositions; but, as we see, it is possible for us sometimes to catch something of the original meaning.

All this indicates that in prehistoric Italic the special function of the *to*-suffix, though it could still be used as a pure adjectival formative, was the formation of the participle of the middle, which became also the passive, conjugation. Now from Italic times the middle voice was felt to be superfluous and began to disappear. Hence we find it in Latin only in a limited number of verbs, the so-called deponents, which in spite of their form can hardly have conveyed any but the active meaning to the Roman, and in some old idioms. Chief among the latter, as we should expect, are expressions of personal action, especially that of ‘putting garments, etc. (on the person)’. We find this not only in Latin with all parts of the verb, as Verg. Aen. VII. 640 loricam induitur; ib. II. 275 *exuuias* indutus; ib. II. 511 inutile ferrum | cingitur; ib. II. 392 Androgei galeam clipeique insigne decorum | induitur; Ter. Eun. 4. 4. 40 et eam est (sc. uestem) indutus?; Plaut. Rud. 207 hoc quod induta sum, etc., but also in the Umbrian Tab. Iguv. VI. b. 49 *perca arsmatiam anouihimu* ‘let him put on the sacred bough’. From this we may draw two conclusions: first that the idiom is not borrowed from the Greek, but is an old Italian expression with verbs of this type; secondly that

in uestem *indutus* the *tus*-form is part of the conjugation *induor* and not a pure adjective.¹ If the examples of the *tus*-form with the accusative are more numerous in Latin, it is a mere accident and due to subordination. We have seen that besides the accusative of the garment, the *tus*-participle is also found very commonly with the accusative of the part of the body. We have quoted numerous examples, which shew that the participle has an active force and that the construction can in no way be due to the poetical use of the accusative with adjectives like *nudus pedem*, etc. This use of the middle is common in Greek; with verbs of personal action having no object it is natural enough. Thus *λούμας* (Attic *λοῦμαι*) meant 'I perform the act of washing for myself', then 'I wash myself'; but when there is an object, as in *λοεσσαμένη τέρπεια χρόα* (Hes. Op. 520), the middle is unnecessary and doubtless due to the use without an object. It was only to be expected that in a language like Italic, in which the middle voice was losing ground from prehistoric times, this idiom should not have been as insistent as the use of the middle with the 'accusative of the garment'. Its revival with the *tus*-participle in the poets is, as we shall see, largely due to the analogy of the 'accusative of the garment'. Calling to mind the use of some of the *to*-participles in Sanskrit with both a passive and an active force, as *prāptah* 'obtained' and 'having obtained', *právistah* 'entered' and 'having entered', *pitah* 'imbibed' and 'having drunk', *vibhaktah* 'divided' and 'having divided' and a few more, we might be inclined to postulate for prehistoric Italic also a *tus*-participle with an active as well as a middle sense. There is nothing to disprove such a theory; but, if the participle ever had much vogue in the active, is it probable that so useful a form would have been lost except in limited and poetical usages? The support which Latin *cenatus*, *pransus*, *iuratus*, Oscan *deiuatu(n)s* 'iurati', Umbrian *çersnatur* 'cenati' would give counts for nothing, since these instances are isolated and arose in another way. Also the *tus*-form did not from its

¹The use of the infin. with the acc. (e. g. *nequeunt expleri corda tuendo*, Verg. Aen. VIII. 265) is comparable, since that also is of nominal origin and unconnected with voice and other verbal characteristics.

origin, which we have briefly reviewed above, inherit an accusative object. It is probable then that the accusative of the part of the body in Latin was resumed on the analogy of the garment; it was not a very great step, especially when the feeling of the middle had been lost, from such an expression as *uestem succinctus* to *corpus cinctus, comas succinctus, uelatus tempora* (Ovid), etc. This idiom by its simplicity appealed to generations of Latin poets; hence we find it in all kinds of expressions of bodily action, as *pectus percussa, genas laniata, oculos conuersi*, etc. (See the examples from Vergil quoted above.) The poets also transferred the construction from the concrete or literal to the abstract or metaphorical, so that Ennius writes *succincti corda machaeris*, and so perhaps by the analogy of the opposite, also *percussi pectora Poeni*, which Lucretius imitates in *percussae corda tua ui*. Other examples of the use of the accusative of the part of the body as the direct object with the *tus*-participle from various verbs are: Verg. Georg. I. 349 *Cereri torta redimitus tempora quercu | det motus*; Aen. III. 81 *uittis et sacra redimitus tempora lauro*; Aen. IV. 216 *Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem | subnexus*; Aen. V. 269 *puniceis ibant euincti tempora taenis*; Buc. VI. 68 *ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor | floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro | dixerit*; Buc. VII. 32 *puniceo stabis suras euincta cothurno*; Hor. Epist. II. 1. 110 *fronde comas uincti cenant*. On the analogy of these we have such expressions as: Verg. Georg. IV. 482 *caeruleosque implexae crinibus anguis | Eumenides*; Hor. Epode V. 15 *Canidia breuibus implicata uiperis | crines et incomptum caput*. Further due to the analogy of the opposite idea we find: Verg. Aen. III. 65 *et circum Iliades crinem de more solutae*; Aen. XI. 35 *et maestum Iliades crinem de more solutae*; Aen. IV. 509 *crinis effusa sacerdos | ter centum tonat ore deos*; Georg. IV. 337 *caesariem effusae nitidam per candida colla*. Constructed on the analogy of 'wearing' or 'putting on' similarly we find the expression of the opposite, as Verg. Aen. IV. 518 *unum exuta pedem uincis, in ueste recincta, | testatur moritura deos*. Of course, some of these examples are on the borderline between the active and passive (i. e. in this case the descriptive or adjectival) use of the *tus*-form in meaning. But, when the idiom was established in the way we have sug-

gested, exact distinction was unnecessary; nor would the poet spend thought on it. In many instances the passive or descriptive interpretation is quite impossible. A more difficult example is Hor. Epist. I. 1. 94 *si curatus inaequali tonsore capillos* | occurro, rides; but in view of the extension of the idiom it is natural to regard *capillos* as the direct object of the transitive *curatus* and *tonsore* as instrumental. Very similar to this is Vergil Aen. V. 135 *uelatur fronde iuuentus*, | *nudatosque umeros oleo perfusa nitescit*. The participle has the acc. as the direct object also in Catullus LXIV. 65 *coniecta pectus amictu*; ib. 297 *restrictus membra catena*. We must also regard as active in meaning such examples as Verg. Aen. I. 657 *noua pectore uersat* | *consilia, ut faciem mutatus et ora* Cupido | *pro dulci Ascanio ueniat* (cf. v. 684 which makes the question of agency clear); and such metaphorical uses as Georg. IV. 357 *huic percussa noua mentem* formidine mater.

The 'accusative of the garment' with the *to*-participle is also extended in use by analogy both in the literal and metaphorical senses. Simple instances are: Hor. Sat. I. 6. 74 and Epistles I. 1. 55-56 *haec recinunt iuuenes dictata senesque* | *laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto*, where *suspensi* has the sense of 'wearing suspended'; Verg. Aen. XII. 224 *formam adsimulata Camerti*. The same idiom seems to occur in Verg. Aen. II. 220 *ille simul manibus tendit diuellere nodos* | *perfusus sanie uitias atroque ueneno*; it can hardly be passive here. Very similar to these are Aen. VII. 796 *agmina densentur campis* Rutuli ueteresque Sicani, | et Sacrae acies et *picti scuta* Labici, where *picti scuta* must mean 'wearing (or bearing) their shields painted', i. e. 'carrying emblazoned shields'; and Aen. IX. 581 *stabat in egregiis Arcentis filius armis* | *pictus acu chlamydem*, which comes to mean 'wearing an embroidered robe'. A further application of the same construction we find in Aen. X. 157 *Aeneia puppis* | *prima tenet rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones*. So in a more imaginative and poetic expression Vergil's flowers spring up 'putting on (as they grow) as inscriptions the names of kings': *dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum* | *nascantur flores* (Buc. III. 106). It would be possible to construe Buc. I. 54 *hinc tibi quae semper uicino ab limite saepes* | *Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti* | *saepe leui somnum suadefit inire su-*

surro in the same way; but the context favours the passive interpretation. Editors generally regard all these examples as passive and explain the accusative either as 'extent' or even less happily as 'respect' (German 'Beziehung') or as 'retained' from the active construction. Apart from the general unsuitability of the passive interpretation and the prosaic turn which it gives to these passages, the former explanation is very difficult to apply and always unnecessary since the construction is not a Graecism but a very natural poetic development of an old Italian idiom. The theory of the 'retained' accusative also lacks conviction; for it generally involves the dative of the active becoming the subject in the passive, which we must feel is alien to the Latin language and can hardly occur in a combination so old and beautiful as the *to-participle* with the accusative. In Greek and English, which are both more flexible than Latin in this respect, such a passive is, of course, not uncommon. (For examples see Class. Rev. XXIX (1915).) Whether this peculiar ability affected the construction of the passive participle with the acc. in Greek, it is not easy to decide, since in that language too there are other possibilities. The accusative was always used more freely in Greek than in Latin, and if we may cite as evidence the common use of the accusative with passive and intransitive verbs in the modern Greek vernacular,¹ this inherited freedom appears to have been extended with time. It is true that in Latin we find isolated examples of intransitive verbs used in the passive as *inuideor* (Hor. Ars Poet. 56); but they are rare and experimental. The *to-participle* with the accusative on the other hand is a very common poetical expression and in cases where the context favours an active sense we have seen that the construction can easily be traced to an old Italian idiom.

We must, however, also notice instances in which the passive sense is required, as Verg. Aen. II. 57 and 273, Georg. IV.

¹In modern Greek prose we find it not only with the 'passive' participle as θάλασσα . . . διστρός δέρρος στολισμένη (in Psychares' τὸ ταξίδι μου), 'The sea . . . adorned with white foam', but also with passive and intransitive verbs as τὴν στεφανώρεται (στεφανώρεται means literally 'he is wreathed') for 'he marries her'; τῆς θάλασσας τὰ κύματα τρέχω 'I hasten over the waves of the sea'.

371, Hor. Epoede IV. 3 (all quoted above); Verg. Buc. VI.
15 Silenum pueri somno uidere iacentem | *inflatum* hesterno
uenas, ut semper, Iaccho; Aen. I. 579 his *animum arrecti*
dictis et fortis Achates | et pater Aeneas iamdudum erumpere
nubem | ardebant, etc. How are such passages as these to be
explained? Originally they are probably due to an illogical
extension of the idiom; the construction applicable to the *to-*
participle with a transitive force in Latin has been transferred
to the form in its current usage in classical times. This, no
doubt, helped to prepare the way for the introduction of the
Greek accusative with adjectives in *nudus pedem*, etc. The
latter then took some part in confirming the use of the acc.
with the *to*-participle in a passive sense especially when it is
mainly *adjectival* in use, as *nudatus pedem*, *inflatum . . .*
uenas, etc.

CLARA M. KNIGHT.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
KING'S COLLEGE.

V.—LATER ECHOES OF THE GREEK BUCOLIC POETS.

(SUPPLEMENTARY TO A. J. P., XXX 245-283.)

THEOCRITUS.

Idyl I. Paraphrased in Trissino's eclogue 'Dafne', on the death of Cesare Trivulzio. Imitated by Joannes Leochaeus Scotus, Eclogae Piscatoriae, ii (Musae Priores, Londini, 1620). Imitated by Houdard de Lamotte, 'Tircis et Silvandre'. Enrico Carrara cites an imitation by Bernardo Tasso, 'Epicedio di Antonio Broccardo'.

Lines 1-11 and 62-63 are borrowed by San Martino, Pesca-toria et Ecloghe, Ecl. iii (Venice, Giolito, c. 1566).

Lines 15-18 are imitated by Bernardino Baldi, Egloga xi, 'Il Dio Pane'.

With lines 39-44 compare San Martino, Prosa iii: "ma fra questo par che un uecchio dalla riua una rete raccolga . . . gonfia per lo estremo sforzo le uene de la gola". Also Nicolaus Giannettasius Parthenius, Ecl. iii—of a prize bowl which bears a picture of an old fisherman:

cui nudo, nimium nitenti educere ponto
retia, purpureo turgescant sanguine venae,
et duri multo tenduntur robore nervi,
omnibus ut credas piscari viribus illum.

So in Parini's 'La Gara' there is a prize cup with a picture of an old fisherman.

Idyl II. Several passages are imitated in Sannazzaro's fifth Eclogue, 'Herpylis Pharmaceutria'. Compare the 'rhombus aeneus' of line 33 with ὁδε βόμβος δ χάλκεος, line 30. Also lines 37-39:

Alga tibi haec primum, tumidi purgamina ponti,
Spargitur et rapidis absumitur arida flammis;
Sic mihi, sic, Maeon, uraris adusque medullas,

with lines 23–26; lines 60–61:

Tunde iecur spumamque simul torpedinis atrae.
Haec ego cras illi lethalia pocula mittam,

with line 58; lines 67–68:

Curre age, tange simul, simul obline; cras mihi poenas
Perfidus ille dabit, gemet ipso in limine Maeon,

with lines 59–60. The name ‘Clearista’, line 41, comes from Id. II, 74.

Idyl III. Paraphrased in Trissino’s eclogue ‘Batto Capraro’. Imitated by Joannes Leochaeus Scotus, Eclogae Vintoniae, ii, ‘Comastes’. E. Carrara cites a paraphrase by Benedetto Varchi, Ecl. i.

Lines 15–16 are cited by Francesco Barbaro, De Re Uxor, ii. 9 (1416): “Idem quoque iucundissimus poeta Theocritus, cum saevum detestatur Cupidinem, non quod Venere matre natus sit, sed quod leaenae mammas desuxisset, incusat.”

Idyl IV. Imitated by G. B. Guarini, Ecl. iii, perhaps about 1460 (E. Carrara, La Poesia Pastorale, p. 246).

Idyl VII. Lines 1–26 are imitated by Janus Anysius, Ecloga Ursus (Varia Poemata, Naples, 1531, p. 73):

Dona ferebamus Mariae,
Iamque apparebant nobis Nolana sepulchra,
Quum ecce ex arborea scena pulchroque vireto
Audimus magna ingeminari voce Mycona;
Ilicet ad vocis sonitum convertimus ora.
Ursus erat iuvenis
Unde, Mycon optate, inquit, quo, care magister,
Tam pede festino atque ocreis quassantibus alta
Virgulta et dumos?

The name ‘Phrasidamus’, line 3, is borrowed by Sannazaro, Ecl. iv. 24.

Idyl VIII. With lines 23–24 compare San Martino, Ecl. iii:

Questa mia Tibia nuova, si ch’ à farla
Mi punsi un dito: e’l duol non par ch’ allenti.

With lines 53–55 compare Joannes Stigelius, Id. ii:

Non mihi sit regnum Pelopis, non aurea gaza,
Non mihi Olympiaci fallax victoria lustri:
Hoc sub monte canam;

also Flaminius Raius, Id. ii, 'Mopsus':

Quaerat opes alius vel pondera divitis auri.¹
 Nil magis optarim pecudum quodcumque per orbem est,
 Dum tecum, o Amarylli, levi considere in umbra
 Mollibus ac pratis liceat decerpere flores
 Purpureos, vinctamque simul retinere lacertis
 Et terere in silvis tecum feliciter aevum.

Lines 65-70 may be compared with the beginning of Bernardo Tasso's fourth eclogue, 'Galathea', and with the first 14 lines of Francisco de la Torre's third eclogue, 'Eco'.

Idyl IX. Lines 16-21 are paraphrased by San Martino, in one of 'Verduccio's' songs, Ecl. iii.

With lines 22-25 compare Sannazaro, Ecl. iii. 97-101:

Qui tamen et laudes et munera digna tulere
 Carminibus, sed quae nequeat contemnere Triton:
 Hic, quam Circeo nudus sub gurgite cepi
 Nativis concham maculis et murice pictam,
 Ille, recurvato nodosa corallia truncō.

With lines 25-27 compare San Martino, Prosa iii, where one of the prizes is "il uagho guscio d'una maritima lumaca ... delle cui polpe si satiarono gia cinque Pastori in una cena".

Idyl X. The name 'Polybotas', line 15, is borrowed by Sannazaro, Ecl. ii, 18.

Idyl XI. Paraphrased by Eobanus Hessus, Id. xv.

With lines 19 ff., cp. Gay's 'Acis and Galatea', "O ruddier than the cherry", etc.

Lines 42-48 are imitated by Bernardo Tasso, Egloga iv, 'Galathea', and by Gerolamo Pompei, Canzoni Pastorali, viii.

Idyl XII. Lines 1-2 are imitated by Jo. Pierius Valerianus, 'Amantium timores variii', 1-4:

Tertia iam lux est, Patavi cum Daphnia in agros
 Discessit, Theoli rura superba petens;
 Tertia quin aetas, una nam luce senescunt
 Quos gravis ardor habet, quos ferus urit amor.

¹Cp. Tibullus, I. i. i, "Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro", and I. 9. 31, "divitis auri Pondere".

Lines 2-9 are imitated by J. Leochaeus Scotus, Ecl. Bucol. i:

Credimus? an qui amant una vel luce senescunt?
 Quantum ver hyemem, quantum redolentia mala
 Pruna super, quantum propria villoso agnus
 Matre tener, vietum iuvenis florente iuventa
 Quam superat, plenis virgo quam nubilis annis
 Ter viduam thalamis multo formosior anteit, etc.

Idyl XIII. Paraphrased by Parny, in 'La journée chameau-pêtre'.

Idyl XV. The name 'Praxinoe', line 1, is borrowed by Sanmazaro, Ecl. ii. 18.

This Idyl was apparently Bernardino Baldi's warrant for writing eclogues in which the speakers were women—"cosa non fatta da altri ch' io mi sappia, eccetto alcuna volta da Theocrito". Cp. his 'La Maestra d'amore' and his 'Melibea'. But Lorenzo Gambara had already done the same thing, Nautica, vii.

Idyl XVI. With lines 14-15 compare Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. v. 160-5:

At si forte aliquis regum gerit aspera bella
 Et decus armorum studiis belloque paravit,
 Nil genus externum venturaque saecula curat
 Laude suae gentis satur et praesentibus annis;
 Barbarus est neque carmen amat vel avarus in auro
 Mergitur atque Midae curis flagrantibus ardet.

With lines 64-65 cp. Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. v. 188-190:

Vade malis avibus numquam redditurus, avare,
 Et facias subito quidquid tractaveris aurum
 More Midae, quando virtus tibi vilior auro.

Idyl XVII. With lines 9-11 cp. Poliziano, 'Manto', 39-43 (1482):

Unde ego tantarum repetam primordia laudum?
 Aut qua fine sequar? facit ingens copia rerum
 Incertum. Sic frondifera lignator in Ida
 Stat dubius, vastae quae primum robora sylvae
 Vulneret.

Idyl XVIII. Lines 19, 25-28, 38-48, are paraphrased by Gabriel Altilius, 'Epithalamium' (1489).

Lines 26–28 may be compared with Berardino Rota, Ecl. iv, ‘Amarilli’:

Quanto l’Aurora è più uermiglia e chiara
 De l’ombra de la notte, e primauera
 Più bella assai del pigro e uecchio uerno;
 Tanto, Amarilli, à me più dolce e cara
 D’ognialtra sei.

Idyl XIX. Translated by Fabius Segnius, ‘De Amore favos mellis furante, Ex Theocrito’. Translated by Alciati.

Idyl XXI. Paraphrased by Amadis Jamyn, ‘Le Songe d’un Pescheur’.

J. Leochaeus Scotus has a dialogue between two old fishermen, Ecloga Piscatoria, iv. And there are two or three lines in it which definitely suggest Theocritus, Id. XXI.

Idyl XXIII. Paraphrased by Robert Herrick, ‘The Cruel Maid’.

Idyl XXV. With line 50 cp. Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. v. 60–61:

Hoc amor, hoc pietas, hoc vult Deus; omnia non dat
 Omnibus, ut nemo sibi sit satis indigeatque
 Alter ope alterius.

Idyl XXX. (‘The Dead Adonis’.) Paraphrased by Antonius Sebastianus Minturnus, ‘De Adonide ab apro interempto’. See, also, Lodovico Paterno, Egl. Amor. i, ‘Coridone’.

BION.

Idyl I. Imitated by Sainct-Gelays, ‘Elégie ou chanson lamentable de Vénus sur la mort d’Adonis’.

With line 28 compare Byron, ‘Don Juan’, xvi. 109:

Who would not sigh *Alai τὰν Κυθέπειαν*.

Lines 40–53 and 80–85 are paraphrased by Lodovico Paterno, Egloghe Amoroise, i, ‘Coridone’.

Idyl IX. Paraphrased by Antonius Marius, ‘Ad Vesperam’.

MOSCHUS.

Idyl I. With lines 3–5, compare Spenser, F. Q. iii. 6, 12:

She promised kisses sweet, and sweeter things,
 Unto the man that of him tydings to her brings;

also, Robert Browning, *The Ring and the Book*, ix,

Thus Venus losing Cupid on a day
(See that *Idyllium Moschi*) seeking help, etc.

Idyl II. Lines 77-135 are paraphrased by Lodovico Paterno, *Ecloghe Amoroise*, i, 'Coridone'.

Idyl III. Paraphrased by Trissino, 'Pharmaceutria, De morte Batti'. Imitated by Basilius Zanchius, Ecl. i, 'Meliseus'. The greater part of the poem is paraphrased by Eobanus Hes-sus, 'Epicedion Mutiani Rufi' —

Flere libet quali doctum flevisse Biona
Carmine Trinacrius creditur ante senex.

And lines 42, 87-91, 99-104 are imitated in the same author's 'Epicedion Alberti Dureri'.

With line 6 compare P. Francius, 'Lycoris', "et plenius
ai ai Tristibus inscribit foliis".

Lines 30-44 are imitated in the 'Bergerie' of Remy Belleau (ed. Marty-Laveaux, ii. 136-7), a lament on the death of Joachim du Bellay.

With lines 99-104 compare Janus Dousa, the Younger, 'Daphnis Ecloga' (on the death of Sir Philip Sidney) :

Hei mihi, quod malvas, ubi defecere, sequenti
Cum reliquis herbis videas aestate renatas;
At nobis, qui tam magnum spiramus, homullis,
Cum semel exiimus, nunquam datur inde reverti.

Idyl V. Imitated by Léonard, 'Les Plaisirs du Rivage'.

Idyl VIII. Imitated in one of Parini's sonnets, 'De Mosco, Epigramma'. Cp. Millevoye, 'L'Amour laboureur'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Studies in Magic from Latin Literature, by EUGENE TAVENNER.
New York, Columbia University Press, 1916.

In this Columbia University dissertation the author proposes "to furnish a general introduction to Roman magic, especially as reflected in Latin literature and to add a chapter on Roman prophylactic magic." To this he promises, later, to add chapters on various phases of the same subject.

To him who is not a specialist in classical folk-lore undoubtedly the first part which contains the conclusions drawn by the author from the mass of materials at his disposal will prove the most interesting. It is also the most controversial.

Professor Tavenner starts with a definition of the words *μάγος*, *μαγεία*, magus, magicus. In a brief survey of the Greek passages in which the words occur he reaches the conclusion, which is true, though not new, that there were priestly Persian magi who accompanied Xerxes into Greece under their leader Osthanes, and who, on account of their connection with the archenemy of the Greeks, were reduced in the estimation of the Hellenes to the position of rascals and tricksters. As such they were known throughout the fifth and fourth centuries before our era, both in literature and in popular conception. The development in the meaning of the Greek words is reflected in Latin, where, however, the philosophical connotation of *magus* is much more limited in usage, and the popular conception far more preponderant.

The author then turns to the definition of *magic*. This he bases chiefly on the well-known opening paragraph of Pliny, N. H. XXX, Apuleius, Apol. 26, and Ps.-Quintilian, Decl. Maior 10, 15 and 19. From these passages he defines the Roman conception of magic as a compound of elements drawn from medicine, religion and astrology, with which man attempted to control the gods and thereby the phenomena of nature in accordance with his own selfish desires. Professor Tavenner correctly compares this definition with that of modern students of magic. He then proceeds to distinguish magic as "unorganized scientific interpretation" from science proper, also from astrology, superstition and religion. In all this, it cannot be said that he adds any new contribution to existing knowledge. It is here, too, that I must beg to differ from him on principle. He considers magic as "the active practice of

controlling natural phenomena by preternatural means" and superstition as "the passive belief *per se* without any practical side." Yet as far as I can command a bird's-eye view of the field of superstition, it has always for its complement the practice of certain rites to obtain certain effects, an idea which years ago I attempted to define as "*die Vorstellung vom Uebersinnlichen und seine Kultuebung* (Pauly-Wissowa, I, 29, 3 foll.). I still see the difference between magic and superstition in this, that magic is (a) a foreign (chiefly oriental) importation; (b) is systematized as a "discipline"; (c) is aggressive, i. e., wants to compel transcendental powers to do the bidding of man. Superstition, on the other hand, is defensive and wishes to ward off the evil influence of transcendental powers. A similar view, it seems to me, is expressed in the fundamental investigations of Messrs. Hubert and Mauss in *L'Année Sociologique* VII, 1. In the *Lexikon der griechischen und roemischen Religion*, the publication of which has unfortunately been stopped by the war, I said that "Superstition is that field of religious thought which has been eliminated from the living practice of religion and which is no longer felt as universally valid in the consciousness of human society," and "no more than there can exist a religion of mere faith without a common cult ritual, no more does there exist a *mere* superstitious belief without its practical expression in 'Zauber'". In the same article I called attention to the fact that it is a misnomer to name this practice *magic*, because such use of the word is historically incorrect. Tavenner, with others, follows the usage of J. G. Frazer and his school, which seems to have spread very largely among anthropologists, but against which especially the classical scholar is bound to protest. If it were not for this loose use of the word, Tavenner would not, in his paragraph of the legal aspect of magic, quote the Twelve Tables as forbidding magic. Nor would he have spoken of the existence of a nameless kind of magic characteristic of the rural districts. For all of this is merely the practical application of popular religious and superstitious beliefs in "Zauber". Unfortunately our author applies this confusion between the foreign magic and the native superstitious practices also to the Pliny passage mentioned above, to which he has devoted his whole ninth paragraph. Pliny evidently followed in his discussion of the history of magic a Greek source for the development of non-Roman magic, while for Rome he must have added the investigations of some compatriot, perhaps Nigidius Figulus. It is precisely here that Tavenner commits his gravest error, in failing to distinguish between ancient popular beliefs and imported magical prescriptions. Professor Kirby Flower Smith in his article on Magic in Hastings' Encyclopedia has seen

much more clearly, when he uses the same passage to prove that everything which was contrary to the accepted state rituals was considered magic and was therefore punished by law. Tavenner misinterprets the words of Pliny when he says that "within thirty years (480-451) Persian magic must have attained a firm hold on Greece and then made its way to Italy". Pliny does not say at all what Tavenner makes him say, but simply states that there were also magical (and superstitious) practices in older Italy. As a fact, the first date given by Pliny for action against foreign magic is the law of 97 B. C. It is illuminating to notice here the great confusion and at the same time the superficiality with which Professor Tavenner treats all the details of this passage. Why should a Columbia University student quote for Zoroaster the International Encyclopedia instead of Professor Jackson? Nor do the instances which Mr. Tavenner adduces from Homer disprove Pliny's statement that the Iliad is comparatively free from magic. Finally, it does not seem as if Circe could be used to prove that Italy was the home of magic even in early tradition. For that the island of Aiaia is in the West, near Italy and that Circeii was called so because it is the home of Circe is so evidently later, Alexandrian, figment that one is surprised at the naïveté of Tavenner's argument. Why, furthermore, does the magic knowledge ascribed by Vergil to the Massylian priestess prove anything as to the existence of magic in Italy? Finally, the taboos and other rites of Roman religion discussed by Tavenner (p. 25), while they may be called magic in Frazer's sense, were certainly not such to the Romans, as both Smith (l. c.) and myself (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1895) have sufficiently shown.

The tenth chapter is devoted to a survey of the attitude of Latin authors toward magic. The discussion is very interesting, but unfortunately little in it is new, and part of it is utterly futile. Tavenner himself begins with the statement that literary men and the cultured classes were possessed by a rage for everything Greek. Had he only followed this lead, instead of excluding almost all references to Greek influence (on the impossibility of distinguishing Roman and Greek in magic see Smith in Hastings, who perhaps goes too far in the other direction)! Here we also meet with a number of surprising allegations for which I can see no foundation of fact. Varro's work on agriculture and Columella's book on the same topic are both said to be comparatively free from magic belief. Yet in my by no means exhaustive collection in Pauly-Wissowa, I quoted Varro 18 times and Columella 94 times! Especially unsatisfactory is the treatment of the lyric and elegiac poets, remarkably so since the author might have availed himself of the excellent notes in Smith's edition of Tibullus. How imperfect his investigation has been can best be shown by comparing his re-

marks with those of Smith in the Hastings article. He thinks these poets of small value for his survey, yet he cannot fail to give great weight to Catullus and Tibullus. Now it must be clear to every student of ancient superstitions—and Smith has not failed to call attention to it—that all these poets repeat again and again the same items, so that we may well speak of an "apparatus magicus" which they uniformly employ and the existence of which has long led me to suspect that there must have been a handbook of magical actions for poetical use, just as Ovid found a handbook of metamorphoses ready to hand in Nicander's work. In this part, more than anywhere else, we feel how much Tavenner has been handicapped by his exclusion of Greek material from the scope of his dissertation.

No less unsatisfactory is the paragraph on the Roman satirists. The one longer passage from Lucilius (p. 38, n. 198), in which the poet voices his contempt for the figments of Fauni and Numae, can hardly be said to deal with magic, since it refers merely to terriculae (night terrors?) and Lamia, the spook of the nursery. Why Lucilius, the *eques Romanus, as such*, should be expected to be superior to popular belief (p. 38), it is hard to understand. Rather, it seems to me, it is Lucilius, the rationalist and member of the Scipionic circle, who, under the influence of Greek culture, rose above the level of the populace. What Professor Tavenner says about the Canidia poems of Horace is good, but it is not new. As long ago as 1892 I discussed these three poems together in the *Rheinisches Museum* and showed the absolute faithfulness of the poet to the "magic tradition". I concluded that the series forms a clever parody on actual conditions, a contention which holds good even more if Canidia, as Sturtevant (*Class. Rev. XXVI*) seems to me to have proved, was a reality. The mind of Horace, however, is much too complex to be analyzed satisfactorily in the few, rather cavalier, statements of Mr. Tavenner. Certainly C. I, 27, 21 cannot be adduced to show that Horace places magicians and gods on the same level. Here we deal with a well thought-out gradation: the native "wise woman", the foreign sorcerer, the "apotropaic" god; and, of course, Horace is not at all serious in his contention (cp. lines 22–24). A similar misunderstanding is displayed in the statement about Epis. I, I, 32–36. In the first place, it is not at all certain that the words *verba et voces* refer to charming; in the second place, the *libellus* of 37 is by no means a "magic manual", which one could not possibly read three times, but it is a *βιβλίον* in the sense of the magical papyri, viz., merely a description of a magic action. The mention of the "evil eye" in the letter to the *vilicus* cannot be tortured into a proof that the poet still believed in the reality of the danger from the *oculus obliquus*, any more than Catullus can be accused of such belief because he speaks of the *nume-*

rare of the *inviosi*. But the question as to Horace's attitude toward religion, both official and popular, is of far wider scope than can be discussed in the pages of a dissertation.

A peculiar attitude is shown by our author in discussing the Satyricon of Petronius. After enumerating a number of instances of "magical" practices, he concludes that because Petronius in no instance utters a word against magic, he was either not altogether free from belief or else he had the good judgment not to mar his picture by the skepticism affected by the upper classes. I doubt whether any but the latter explanation would have occurred to any one who read the masterwork of the greatest Roman storyteller. The sketch of Apuleius, which follows, is decidedly better than anything else in the book. On the other hand, the chapter on the historians is very weak. While his remarks on Varro and Cæsar are sensible, it borders on the childish to charge Livy with a belief in magic because he incorporates in his narrative the stories of Numa drawing Jupiter from the sky, of the evocatio deorum (a purely religious rite) and so forth. For Livy merely hands on the tradition which he found in his sources without any attempt to judge of their probability or veracity. No better is the treatment of Tacitus. To ascribe to him a belief in astrology means to misinterpret the two famous passages of the Annales, especially the second (VI, 22), in which the historian merely mentions the belief prevalent among the "*plurimi mortalium*", and repeats the specious, but universal argument of the astrologers themselves, but does not take sides either pro or contra.

The most important source for Professor Tavenner's discussion is naturally the Naturalis Historia of the Elder Pliny. In analyzing his attitude he follows very closely the arguments of Professor Thorndike (*The Place of Magic in the Intellectual History of Europe*, 1905). Against both these scholars, however, it must be urged that they fail to recognize Pliny's attitude toward the information that he has gathered. After working through the Natural History more than once, I believe I may assert that Pliny did not care very much whether his information did or did not admit of proof, but merely whether or not it conformed with his ethical ideal, which may be summed up in the words "*aurea mediocritas*". He attempts nowhere to defend the statements which he quotes from his sources, and everywhere adds a *reservatio mentalis* by using the words *dicunt*, *referunt*, *creditur* and others. To say, as Mr. Tavenner does, in summing up, that the Roman authors as a rule either cherish or unwittingly display the magic heritage of the Italic race is simply asserting the unprovable.

The second part of the dissertation deals with Magic and the Prevention of Disease. This contains a rather extensive collection of materials, without presenting anything essentially

new. Certain statements, however, challenge contradiction. To say that Ovid furnishes proof that the early Roman gods practiced magic and to exemplify this by the tale of the magic knot at the birth of Hercules is certainly doing violence to history. The story is Greek from end to end and cannot be converted into genuine Italic by quoting instances of similar practices from Pliny. Nor does the expulsion of the striges by Carna show the goddess as a mere magician. The story has all the earmarks of an etiological tale, to explain a custom of Ovid's time, which may be, and probably is, very ancient, but it does not prove anything about the magical character of Carna. Equally surprising is the attempt to prove the strictly Italic flavor of the miraculous powers of the Marsi by their connection with Circe, who was *not* an Italic goddess. No more can the deification of Febris and perhaps other diseases be claimed as early Roman, except as such phenomena come under the head of the "Sonder- und Augenblicksgötter of Usener (Goetternamen, chapters 9 and 16).

In general, Mr. Tavenner's discussion of Magic and Disease suffers from a faulty method. He enumerates, without criticism, the multifarious statements of Roman writers. Yet a closer inspection will show that here, as in the case of the Roman poets, we deal with an ever recurring body of traditions. Thus, Celsus's statement about the *pullus hirundinis* (p. 73, n. 45) returns again in Pliny XXX, 33; Marcellus Empiricus VIII, 49=Pl. XXIX, 130; M. E. I, 41 (our *only* amulet for the prevention of headache, Mr. Tavenner says)=Pl. XXIX, 113; M. E. XXIX, 13=Pl. XXVIII, 49; Pseudo.-Pl. II, 38=Pl. XXVIII, 215; Ser. Sam. 1031=Pl. XXVIII, 258. It seems to me that the first duty of a writer on the superstitions of the Romans is to collect *all* the material, to sift it by comparison, to trace it back to its oldest source where possible, before a discussion of the value of the statements can be attempted.

The treatment of the Amulet suffers from the same shortcomings as the whole work. It is not based on a sufficiently wide knowledge of the material. Here, if anywhere, it was absolutely necessary to draw upon the immense stores heaped up in museums and archaeological publications. My own collections, though they are very far from exhaustive, have shown me that it is possible to simplify the treatment of the Amulet and to reduce it to certain basic forms (cp. also my article Amulet in Pauly-Wissowa, which was known to Mr. Tavenner (p. 77, n. 62), and Deubner's discussion in his article Amulet in Hastings). Errors are inevitable, of course, in gathering so large a body of information, but it seems rather strange to find among the "purely Roman" superstitions a passage (Pl. XXVII, 89) for which Pliny himself quotes the authority of Xenocrates. The cure of *struma* (Pl. XXVI, 24) does not con-

tain an amulet to prevent the recurrence of the disease, but the plant sideritis must be kept from falling into the hands of evil-minded sorcerers, who might replant it and thereby cause the recrudescence of the illness. Again in Col. VI, 17, 6 the shrew-mouse is not concealed in the ball of clay for its *antipathia*, but its treatment falls under the head of the "horrifying example" to other beasts. Finally, Mr. Tavenner must be said to be rather ingenious in his ferreting out reasons for the potency of things. The wolf is not a courageous beast (Pl. XXVIII, 257). But since this feature of the dissertation has been well discussed by Prof. Pease in his review (Class. Weekly X, 207), I will not dwell on it in this place.

It remains to say a word about the Selected Bibliography at the end. This contains a rather formidable number of titles for a dissertation and it is sometimes difficult to see their bearing on the subject of the work. Some of them are obsolete: Baring-Gould's Were-Wolves is of little value after K. F. Smith's investigations; the same holds good of Blumler's Amulets compared with Kropatschek. Others cannot have been of much use: the Companion to Latin Studies, Kiesewetter's Occultismus, Story's Castle St. Angelo and the Evil Eye do not help much in a specialized investigation. One would like to see others that are omitted. Dieterich's Nekyia, Seeligmann's Boeser Blick, Trumbull's Threshold and Blood Covenant, Roscher's articles on the seven and the nine in religion are some of the more important works apparently unknown to the author, while Kroll is represented only by his popular lecture on Aberglaube, but not by his Chaldaic Oracles.

Yet, in spite of all that I have said, we ought to welcome with good wishes any new worker in a field that has only too willingly been left by the classicist to the anthropologist and the dilettante. Here, more perhaps than anywhere else, does Usener's word hold good (*Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft*) that only the strictest philological method can produce lasting results. We hope that with growing experience Professor Tavenner will give us other and more satisfactory investigations of a most promising subject.

ERNST RIESS.

The Prosecution of Jesus: Its Date, History and Legality.

By RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND. Princeton University Press, 1916. 302 pp. \$1.50 net.

Hitherto the trial of Jesus has been studied largely from the viewpoint of Jewish criminal law. Roman procedure, if considered at all, has been that of the courts at Rome. The

conduct of criminal trials in the provinces, however, differed radically from that of Roman courts, as has been shown by the great work of Mitteis and Wilcken, and therefore the attempts to explain the trial before Pilate by reference to criminal procedure in Rome have been fruitless. More satisfactory is the new interpretation of Professor Husband who approaches the study from the viewpoint of Roman criminal procedure in the provinces. His conclusion is that the trial before Pilate constituted the only trial, the appearance before the Sanhedrin being merely a preliminary hearing or grand jury proceeding at which a charge was formulated for presentation to the Roman governor when he held court at Jerusalem.

Such a theory rests on the assumption that the Jews had lost their criminal law entirely, and also the power to enforce their ecclesiastical law. The evidence, while meager, seems to confirm this supposition; and it is in conformity with the situation in other provinces whose native courts had been replaced by Roman courts and Roman law. But while their law had been taken away, the court machinery had been retained at least in part. The police still had the power of arrest, and the Sanhedrin while still meeting no longer sat as a court but as a grand jury with power to examine cases and formulate charges but without power to pass sentence.

The arrest of Jesus, to follow Professor Husband's view, was made on the night preceding the Passover of 33 A. D. by regular police whom John calls "the band and chief captain and the officers of the Jews", led by Judas, and assisted possibly by a part of the temple guard. It is improbable that Roman soldiers took part in the arrest, or that there was a "multitude" present. The Sanhedrin had previously decided to wait until after the Passover before making the arrest, but after a third meeting plans were changed hurriedly and an immediate arrest was decided upon. Although this action took place at night, by means of armed forces and a traitor, there seems to have been no illegality either in the time or manner of the arrest, as many modern writers have claimed. After his arrest Jesus was taken by the police to the house of the High Priest where he was held until the Sanhedrin could be assembled. The older view holds that there were two meetings, one held after midnight and the other in the early morning, at which Jesus, after a mere pretense of a trial, was condemned on his own testimony, and then bound over to the court of Pilate either for retrial or for execution. Such proceedings would have been unjust and would have violated all the rules laid down so explicitly in Jewish law for the conduct of a criminal trial. It seems unbelievable that a court, noted for its scrupulous observance of all the minutiae of law,

and in the present instance afraid of the people, would discard all legal formalities. If, as has usually been claimed, it had decided to commit some great injustice, would it not have adhered all the more closely to the rules prescribed in order to protect itself from public criticism? No more can the usual interpretation of the Sanhedrin's verdict be supported. All the gospels except that of Mark state that Jesus was pronounced "worthy of death"; Mark alone says that he was condemned to death. These two statements have been considered equivalent, but probably they are quite different. If the Sanhedrin, as Professor Husband maintains, were sitting as a grand jury, its only verdict could have been an indictment, not a sentence. Such an interpretation is supported by the action of the Sanhedrin in the second arrest of Peter and John, where it made the arrest, heard the case, but did not pass sentence. Evidently the Romans had left it no more power. It is further confirmed by the situation in Egypt where local officials examined and prepared cases for the Roman procurator or his agent. It has been objected that the governor of Judea did not have judicial power, but was under the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria, but such an idea rests on a misunderstanding of the facts. Judea constituted two independent judicial districts, and only on special occasions when the governor of Syria was appointed commander of the whole east was it even under his military oversight.

Following his indictment by the Sanhedrin Jesus was sent to Pilate's court on the double charge of false prophecy and treason, really two phases of the same charge, for while the Jews were concerned with crimes against their religion the Romans were interested only in matters pertaining to the civil and criminal law of Rome. By combining the account in the four gospels and the Acts of Pilate the course of the trial can be reconstructed. There is no direct statement that a written charge was preferred or that witnesses were called, but such seems to have been the case. It was a formal trial in a Roman court and few irregularities can be found. The trial opened with a question by Pilate concerning the nature of the charge, a question which has been variously explained, but which was really the formal opening of the court. One prominent feature of the trial was the questioning of the prisoner by Pilate, but this seems not to have been an irregularity as is shown by the letters of Pliny regarding the trial of Christians in Bithynia. At the conclusion of the trial Pilate gave sentence which has been inaccurately translated "I find no fault (or crime) in him"; a verdict, however, that did not mean freeing him from the charge. Pilate knew that Jesus had confessed himself a king, and that many of his followers had expected him to set up an earthly kingdom;

technically, therefore, he would be guilty of treason, although really innocent of any intent or act of treason. This interpretation, if correct, offers a better explanation than is usually given for Pilate's later acts. Instead of being intimidated into reversing his decision by an angry mob, he tried to persuade the Jews to withdraw their charge. When he failed in that, he offered to pardon either Jesus or an untried robber Barabbas, as they preferred; and when that also failed he had no alternative other than to inflict the penalty for treason. This explanation would free Pilate from the charge of executing an innocent man, and would lay the blame for the crucifixion upon the Jews, as many of the writers of the New Testament have done. To many, however, even the explanation of Professor Husband does not free Pilate altogether from the crime of an unjust sentence.

The date of the trial, Friday, April 3, 33 A. D., is later than is usually assigned. From the record of John's gospel and the writings of St. Paul it is found that the Passover came on Friday, and the only years during the public life of Jesus when the Passover occurred on that day were 30 and 33 A. D. The only certain date from which to reckon the beginning of Jesus' ministry is the beginning of John's ministry, the "fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar", meaning, according to Roman historians, the fifteenth year from the accession of Tiberius, not from the time of his association in the rule of Augustus, as many Biblical scholars maintain. Jesus' public ministry must, then, have ended later than 30 A. D. unless one adopts the doubtful view that it lasted but one year. The later date is made probable also by the custom of freeing one prisoner each year, begun by Pilate not earlier than 27, and apparently of some years' standing at the time of the trial of Jesus. The exact dating, however, depends entirely upon an unsupported statement that the Jews reckoned their feasts by astronomical calculation rather than upon the actual appearance of the moon, as many critics claim.

This outline will show, possibly, the character of the argument. Each problem arising from the trial is examined with great care. Jewish as well as Roman law is freely cited. The important modern discussions of the trial have been examined, as the full bibliography shows. In the use of his sources the author disregards to some extent the vast amount of text criticism because he finds valuable information in the later narratives to supplement or correct that found in the gospel of Mark. Although this method is followed there is no careless or uncritical handling of the text; in fact the new interpretation of the trial demands a less radical excision of text than is required by the older view. Altogether the book is a careful, well-reasoned study, presented in an interesting

and impartial manner, and the main conclusions seem to be sound. It is valuable also in that it presents a new angle of study in New Testament problems. One feels that many Biblical scholars wander in the dark because they disregard or are ignorant of the influence of the Greek and Roman world upon Jewish life and thought. For once a classicist has shown them the way.

J. F. FERGUSON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus edited, with introduction and notes by WILFRED P. MUSTARD, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. 123 pp.

The difficulty of securing a publisher for books that are valuable to only a limited number of scholars is well known. Cordial praise is therefore due The Johns Hopkins Press for its generosity in printing now the third contribution that Dr. Mustard has made to the history of the humanistic Pastoral in which he is certainly our chief authority. His text has no important blemishes that the reviewer can detect and he has adduced his parallels from other Latin authors with his usual skill and fulness, often citing also illuminating passages from English, French and Italian. But even one who is such a dabster in this as Dr. Mustard is must inevitably overlook some instances of the poet's dependence. It is certainly not easy in every case to tell what reminiscences were in Andrelinus' "so-called" mind (Erasmus, who had a discerning acquaintance with him, said that there was only one syllable lacking in his poems, namely *vōs* or *mens!*), but his own compilatory methods of composition make his attack on his chief literary enemy Balbus for wearing borrowed plumage a bit amusing. This occurs in the first of four interesting prose documents that appear as Appendixes in our volume.

The chief interest of the Eclogues themselves must be indeed for the ordinary reader the passages that concern the author's own life (e. g. X. 67-102); for as literature I agree with Joubert (Hoefer, Nouvelle Biographie Générale s. v. Andrelinus) elles montrent qu'il n'était qu'un pur arrangeur de mots, pauvre de pensée, dénué de sensibilité et d'invention. He is anything but a gentle shepherd and does not hesitate to use his pastorals for invective (e. g. in XI) that would vacate his professorial chair in a modern university at once, although Bayle (Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, 1740, s. v. Andre-

linus) makes a sufficiently mild reference to it: *Les moeurs de cet auteur n'étoient pas de bon exemple; mais on l'épargna là-dessus, à cause qu'il donnoit du lustre à l'Université de Paris.* His career there as a popular teacher, his connection with Erasmus, the bibliography of his works and his influence upon later writers, especially upon Arnolletus, are admirably set forth in Dr. Mustard's Introduction. Even this, however, hardly gave the reviewer so keen a sense of Andrelinus' quondam glory as the sight of fifty entries under his name in the Catalogue of the British Museum and of ninety in that of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. But very few of them post-date 1600. For most readers the poet's share in the correspondence of Erasmus and the bare possibility that he wrote the famous Dialogue between St. Peter and the Pope Julius II are the abiding points to be associated with his name. If his Catullian comment on *otia* (XII. 98-100) and various samples of worldly wisdom that are peculiarly appropriate to these war-times such as *omnia ieuno sapiunt vel pessima ventri* (VI. 63) and *laudato ingentia tecta, exiguae habitato casas* (VII. 51-52) also stick in the memory, so much the better. In other published works Andrelinus shows that he was as strong in the expression of proverbial philosophy as he was weak in its practice. The reader's only regret may be that Dr. Mustard could not find it within his purpose to elucidate more of the really difficult Latin that is found in both the pastoral writers; he has to assume that those who use his editions are specialists.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XL (1916), 3 and 4.

Pp. 149-189. Paul Lejay. *Essais et Notes sur Virgile*. I. The Expression of an Indeterminate Subject in Latin. Latin has a great variety of terms for expressing French *on*. All have not an equal value, all are not interchangeable. 1. The impersonal or unipersonal passive, as 'curritur'—but without implication of a person as in *on*. The familiar reflexive construction 'vestem induitur' suggests a primitive construction of the passive with an accusative. 2. Passive personal or impersonal with an infinitive, 'adesse eius equites nuntiabantur', 'adesse Romanos nuntiatur' in which M. L. sees the origin of the infinitive construction (O. O.) 3. Personal passive, 'amor' 'on m'aime'. Confined to verbs with accusative object. The dative object takes an impersonal construction 'mihi invidetur'. 4. The first person singular, an artifice of style, of which Horace is notably fond, a sympathetic identification of his judgment with the judgment of the world. <This first person 'on' is a ticklish business but it may serve at a pinch to save Horace's character, as Sat. I 2, 127: Nec vereor 'on ne craint pas'.> 5. The second person singular indicative, a fictitious second person, *not* the reader. 6. The second person singular subjunctive (ideal second person)—especially in the conditional form. Madvig's rule 'Les contradictions de quelques Allemands n'ont pu l'ébranler' <cf. A. J. P. IV 208 f.>. 7. The third person singular, rare in Latin except in judicial formulae and recipes. Under this head M. L. classes 'inquit' <conf. Eng. 'quoth a'>. 8. Third person singular of subjunctive <=inv.>. 9. First person plural indicative. <In English the familiar schoolmaster's 'we' in addressing a class.> In a footnote M. L. calls attention to Mr. Conway's The singular use of 'nos' which he thinks has not received the attention it deserves <A. J. P. XIX 234 (1898); B. P. W. 13. Okt. 1900>. 10. Third person plural, 'dicunt, ferunt', etc., much more widely used in earlier times. 11. quis, aliquis, quisque, etc. 12. homines. 13. Dative of present participle, e. g. 'venientibus'. 14. Different cases of the participle. 15. 'res.' 16. Various abstract nouns 'admiratio est' 'one admires'. The article is intended to do honour to a forgotten treatise of Quicherat and there are flings at grammarians of other nationalities. II. Aventinus Aen. VII 657. Pulcher Auentinus. Mr.

Fowler in the Gathering of the Clans puts 664–669 after 749, and makes it part of the description of Ufens,—a proposition hotly disputed by M. L. III. Cycnus et Cupavo. Aen. X 185 sqq. For Cinyre (186) read Cycni. Cupavo is the son of Cycnus, and the ‘olorinae pinnae’ (v. 187) an *ἐπισημον* of the fatal loves of Cycnus and Phaëthon. Sprengel’s and Ribbeck’s ‘Amor’ is due to a neglect of the difference between ‘voster’ and ‘vostrum’. The details make this section irreducible. IV. *Praeciae*, not *Preciae*. So M and Servius. V. ‘Fervit opus’ not ‘fervet’, despite the MSS. The only form of the infinitive that Vergil knows is ‘fervere’. VI. Vocare. The archaic form of ‘vacare’ was ‘vocare’, and the reading Georg. III 477 may be due either to an archaizing reviser or to the poet himself. VII. Rustum, ruscum. Georg. II 413 read ‘rusti’. ‘Ruscum’ or ‘ruscus’ is the ‘ruscus aculeatus’ of Linnaeus, ‘rustum’, the ‘ilex aquifolium’ (Linn.). VIII. Subicio, sub. Wotke’s article on the archaisms of Vergil, Wiener Studien VIII (1886), needs sifting. Archaisms are found in Georgics as well as in Aeneid as shewn above. In ‘se subicit’ Georg. II 19, Bucol. 10, 73 ‘sub’ means not ‘under’ but ‘from under’. Another old meaning is ‘from the bottom of’. The neglect of this difference between ‘under’ and ‘from under’ has led to misinterpretation <Comp. Gr. *ἴνω*>. IX. A false archaism. Aen. IX 249: Quom . . . tulistis is not an archaism. It has been explained on Hale’s principle of equivalence, but the tenses of ‘paratis’ and ‘tulistis’ are different and Greek parallels with aor. do not serve. The passage is untranslatable into French and M. L. sadly observes, ‘Toute traduction est un commentaire, mais la meilleure traduction est un commentaire infidèle. X. Ignotus deus. An unknown god is a god whose name is not known says the German Birt Rh. M. LXIX (1914) in opposition to the adventurous hypotheses of the German Norden <A. J. P. XXXV 81 foll.>. An unknown god is an unknown god as is clearly shewn by Aen. VIII 389. <‘The made in Germany’ of the German Birt and the German Norden is amusing but quite intelligible in view of the recent developments of the German god.>

Pp. 190–191. Paul Foucart. Ad. Insc. Graec. (Ed. Minor) II¹, No. 1. Restitution proposed in an important Athenian inscription relating to the Samians.

Pp. 192–220. Maurice Badolle. Notes on Valerius Flaccus. I. VI 3–5: ire placet tandem *praesensque* tueri | sternere si Minyas magnoque rependere luctu | regis pacta queat Graiamque absumere pubem. According to normal grammar *praesens* should be *praesentem* or *praesenti*, and though Valerius seems to be ‘capable de tout’, M. B. attempts to save his grammar by

connecting *praesens* with *queat* <in my judgment an enormous hyperbaton; ire placet=voluit is an anacoluthon, much more excusable than the 'futurus esse' of so many Latin grammars <A. J. P. XXXVI 112>. II. VI 208 Alipedemque constitit. Defence of the manuscript reading. III. V 226 poli=in polo. Comp. Verg. VII 748: nemorum=in nemoribus. IV. VIII 83: Colchis spumare venenis. Comp. Cicero de Divinatione 17, 13: Saxaque cana salis niveo spumata liquore. V. List of words manufactured by Valerius, additions to Gebbing's dissertation. V. Patronymics in Valerius Flaccus. VI. Meaning of certain words in Valerius Flaccus. Valerius imitates Vergil and Ovid in the matter of invention and disposition but exhibits a vein of coquetry in modifying the turns of his predecessors <just as Persius has done here and there in his imitations of Horace>.

Pp. 201–209. Salomon Reinach. Panaitios as a critic. It was Panaitios who proved that Aristides the choregus (I. A. II 1257) was not the same as Aristides the Just by reason of the characters of the inscription, posterior to the reform of Eukleides, sixty years after the death of the great statesman. Other problems he solved καθ' ὅμωνυμα. To this eminent critic have been attributed two absurd opinions, one that he denied the Platonic authorship of the Phaedo, the other that Socrates the philosopher was not the target of the Frogs but a certain Socrates, a poet. The origin of the former nonsensical theory attributed to Panaitios has been traced by Zeller, but old Fabricius had anticipated the later historian of Greek Philosophy. The second is emphatically rejected by Zeller who does not deign to confute it. 'A mistake', says Susemihl, 'but there is something in it', and M. Reinach has undertaken to supply the needed proof. The choral passage (R. 1491 sqq.) is aimed not at Socrates himself but at the Socratic set. The scholiast says: Χάριεν οὖν ὅτι νῦν τὴν πρὸς Σωκράτην ἐταιρίαν δῆλοι. Παναίτιος δὲ δῆλα ταῦτα περὶ ἐτέρου Σωκράτους φησὶ λέγεσθαι, τῶν περὶ σκηνὰς φλυάρων, ως Εὐριπίδης. M. Reinach reads ἐταίρου <no confusion more common> and scouts Wilamowitz's suggestion that there must have been another Socrates known to Panaitios, otherwise unknown to us. As for the story that Euripides and Socrates belonged to the same set, it would have been passing strange if they had not come into contact, but their views were diametrically opposed and M. Reinach makes a further emendation to the scholium and reads ως <οὐποτε> Εὐριπίδης.

Pp. 210–211. A. Cartault. Lucrèce, De Rerum Natura IV 1123. Apropos of M. Ernout's edition of Lucretius IV. M. Cartault proposes the following rearrangement 1121, 1122, 1124, 1123, 1125.

P. 212. A. Cartault. Virg. Aen. VI 586. M. Cartault rearranges thus 585, 587, 586, 588, 589.

In the Bulletin Bibliographique Ernout's Morphologie historique du latin with the ed. by Hans Meltzer, and Recueil de textes latins archaïques and his Fourth Book of Lucretius are reviewed by Paul Lejay, who takes up also The Year's Work in Classical Studies ed. by Cyril Bailey, Loew's Beneventan Script <A. J. P. XXXV 340>, Curcio's Orazio Flacco <A. J. P. XXXIV 92>; Carlo Pascal's Poeti e personaggi Catulliani <A. J. P. XXXVII 481>.

Revue des Revues.

Pp. 225-258. Maurice Jeanneret. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines. The article begins with the Bibliography of the Defixionum Tabellae. This is followed by a general Introduction and a First Part dealing with the phonetics of the tablets—to be succeeded by other topics. A summary is out of the question.

Pp. 259-262. Louis Havet. *Lectulus* lit de table. *Lectulus* is not only a diminutive or a synonym of *lectus* 'bed'; it may be something very different, a 'fauteuil'. Both *lectus* and *lectulus* are also used of the couches on which the Romans reclined at meals. But in Plautus, Terence and Cicero *lectus* is the word used for the indoor table couch, *lectulus*, for a similar outdoor piece of furniture. Hence, in Ter. Ad. 285, for 'lectulos' read 'lectus <sis>'.

Pp. 263-265. Paul Collart. Nonnos, Dionysiaques, VII 100 sqq. For σῆμα νέης θεότητος variously corrected, read σῆμά της θεότητος.

Pp. 266-267. Paul Lejay. Dissimilation of Latin prefixes in writing. Until towards the year 150 A. D. assimilation was the rule, then dissimilation made steady progress. St. Augustine wrote 'inmanis' not 'immanis' as is shown by his discussion of inmanibus (in manibus) contextit lumen Job 36, 32.'

Pp. 268-269. Paul Lejay. An Indicative in Indirect Discourse. Cic. de signis 8. M. Lejay argues for 'fuerunt' (RY) against 'fuerint' (p), and for the abandonment of the dependent construction in other cases.

In the Bulletin Bibliographique there are notices of Dean's Index to Facsimiles in the Palaeographical Society Publications, Studi della Scuola Papirologica di Milano, Mathieu's Aristote, Constitution d'Athènes,—all by Maurice Badolle; Gaselee, The Greek Manuscripts in the Old Seraglio at Constantinople (Lebègue), Willemse's Lateinische Inschriften für den Ge-

brauch im Schulunterricht, Amatucci's *Storia della letteratura romana*, Michaut's *Histoire de la comédie romaine*, Andresen's Halm's *Tacitus T. I*, Miss Ballou's *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta* (Paul Lejay).

Table.

Revue des revues.

B. L. G.

HERMES XLIX.

Fascicle I.

Das Proömium der Theogonie (1-16). P. Friedländer defends the much debated proem of the Theogony, almost in its entirety. He maintains that Hesiod's poetry has been judged by a standard that does not allow for his peculiar and erratic style (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 451). F.'s principle is to retain a doubtful passage if it secures a better transition than would be obtained by eliminating it. The hymn to the Muses (vv. 36-115), when compared with the Homeric hymns, shows that H. followed a conventional form of composition, though somewhat more archaic. He begins in the usual style (vv. 1-4), after which there seems to be a gap; then follow vv. 5-21, which lead in conventional style to the abrupt reference to himself (vv. 22-35), and now, after this personal passage, he makes, awkwardly, a new beginning in his hymn to the Muses. All that Hesiod has written shows double and multiple strata, but nothing more so than the proem of the Theogony. The article is full of special points.

Pandora (17-38). C. Robert throws light on the Pandora-myth of Hesiod by combining literary evidence with that of vase paintings. A red-fig. crater of the Ashmolean museum in Oxford pictures Epimetheus (named), with a hammer in his right hand, welcoming with his left Pandora (named), adorned as a bride and rising up out of the earth, etc. We have here a nature myth, older than Hesiod, according to which the 'all-giving' earth-goddess, after passing the winter in the hardened, frozen earth, is set at liberty in spring by blows of a hammer (ax, in some versions). Ramifications of this myth are: the return of Kore, the imprisonment of Peace (Arist.), the binding of Hera by Hephaestus, etc. Hesiod's version, told first in the Theogony (570-589), and later expanded in the Erga (60-105), introduces an etymology of *πανδώρα* that has exercised ancient and modern interpreters. Robert traces the various stages of the myth of molding mankind out of clay, which began with woman, originating in Hesiod's antagonism to woman-kind (Theog. 598-612). The opening of the *πίθος*,

which has been regarded as a fable motif (cf. Prell. *Myth.* 1⁴, p. 98), has been correctly connected by J. Harrison (*Prolegom.* 43) with the *Πιθοτύα*, another parallel to the liberation of the earth goddess; Hesiod changes the souls (*κῆρες*) of the Anthesteria to the ills (*κῆρες*) of mankind (*Erga* 92). This creation-myth was developed by Semonides, Plato (*Protag.* 320 C ff.) and others. Prometheus as the creator of woman seems to have originated with Sophocles in his *Πανδώρα* ή *Σφυροκόποι*, which is humorously illustrated in a vase painting. R. maintains the genuineness of the Hesiodean passages and comments on his style.

Die Commentare des Asklepiades von Myrlea (39–46). Ada Adler determines the character and extent of the philological work of Asclepiades of Myrlea and shows that the author of *περὶ τῆς Νεωτορίδος* (*Athenaeus XI* 488 a–494 b, etc.) was capable of writing a Pindaric commentary.

Staatsrechtliches zum Putsch von 411 (47–69). U. Kahrstedt modifies his views (*Forschungen*, p. 239 f.), thereby coming nearer to Busolt, Griech. Gesch. III 1477 A. 4 ff. Thucydides', in general, better account can be harmonized with Arist. *Pol.* 29 f., if we recognize that the function of the *συγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες* ended with the laying of their propositions before the *ἐκκλησία*, which they, virtually *οἱ περὶ Πείσανδρον*, not the prytanes (Busolt, l. c., III, p. 1478), had called to meet on the Colonus. The formal conduct of the proceedings was left to the submissive prytanes. The words of Thucydides (VIII 69) ή *ἐκκλησία κυρώσασα ταῦτα*, merely mean the ratification of the work of the *συγγραφεῖς*, thirty in number (Arist. l. c. 29, 2), not ten (Thuc. VIII 67). 2. Aristotle, more exact than Thucydides in paraphrasing the *ψηφίσματα*, states (l. c. 29, 2–4) that the *συγγραφεῖς* were authorized to propose, without fear of prosecution, measures for the *σωτηρία* of the state; hence a second *ἀδεῖα* was necessary to permit propositions to alter the constitution. Further the failure to report on the laws of Cleisthenes, as requested by Cleitophon, shows that no codification of the laws of the sixth century B. C. were extant, which should make us cautious in accepting statements as to the reforms of Solon and Peisistratus, i. e. of the period, in which the institutions of the fifth and fourth centuries originated. 3. The solution of the discrepancy between Thuc. VIII, 67, 3 and Arist. l. c. 29, 5, as to the way in which the one hundred were to be appointed, is that the former was a motion not recorded officially; because it was superseded by an amendment, on which Aristotle's account is based as well as [Lysias] XX, 2. Cf. Busolt, Gr. Gesch. III 1481 A. 1 ff. K. reaffirms his belief (cf. *Forschungen* 254) that Arist. l. c. 30 and 31 are of no value.

Plotinische Studien (70-89). H. F. Müller shows that Plotinus' philosophy was Hellenic, not Oriental; his *unio mystica* with the One, the Source of life, etc., was Platonic in character, reached through stages of purification and consummated in concentrated thought; not a nebulous state of quietism attained by means of magic formulae, etc. That Plotinus was far from being a dreamer is shown by many evidences of his practical good sense. His discussions concerning Astrology occur in *περὶ τοῦ εἰ ποιεῖ τὰ ἀστρα* and other writings. P. accepted the Stoic doctrine of the *συμπάθεια τῶν ὀλων*, and conceded the possible influence of the planets on the physical condition of man; but *ἀρετὴ ἀδέσποτον*. The article is neatly rounded off as a biographical sketch; cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 448.

Zu den griechischen Schwuropfern. Τόμα. 'Ιερὰ τέλεια (90-101). P. Stengel contributes a Nachtrag to his "Opferbräuche der Griechen", discussing additional passages to show that the *τόμα*, on which an oath-taker stood were the testicles of the animal sacrificed. This explains Aristoph. Lys. 185 f., and makes it probable that *ἱππον* (l. c. 192) meant the *γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον*, and that *ἐκτεμοίηθα* (Ravennas) should be read. Secondly, the *ιερὰ τέλεια* meant the *σπλάγχνα omnia et integra*.

ΤΟΡΤΥΝΙΩΝ ΟΡΚΟΣ ΝΟΜΙΜΟΣ (102-109). J. Brause discusses the text of the Gortynian inscription published in J. Kohler and E. Ziebarth's book "Das Stadtrecht von Gortyn u. seine Beziehungen zum gemeingr. Rechte", and adds a few emendations.

Aedilis lustralis (110-119). O. Leuze argues that the title of aed(ilis) lustr(alis) in the Tusculan inscriptions CIL XIV 2603 and 2628 was synonymous with aedilis · quinquennalis. Hence Mommsen's assumption of a sacerdotal aed. lustr. in Tusculum falls to the ground, and with it A. Rosenberg's derivation of the Roman office of aedile from Tusculum. The sodales in CIL XIV 2636 were not the sacerdotes Tusculani (CIL V 5036), but the sodales juvenum, who had their own aedile.

Plinius' Reisen in Bithynien und Pontus (120-136). U. Wilcken modifies Mommsen's itinerary and dates of Pliny's travels in Asia Minor, to the effect that Pliny did not leave Bithynia for Pontus until the second year of his administration, and, instead of journeying overland, went by boat, as the chief towns were on or near the coast. He gives a table of places, based on Mommsen's, from which the letters were sent, or to which they refer.

Zu Aristoteles Eth. Nic. III 1 (137-142). K. Uhlemann analyses this chapter and shows how Aristotle rectified from a practical standpoint the theoretical classification of certain acts as *έκούσια*, although under psychical compulsion. He regards as an interpolation III 10 a 26-34.

Zu Antiphon (143-148). Th. Thalheim proposes a number of emendations: I 1. ή γάρ τύχη—καταστήναι should be transposed to follow γεγένηται, and the relative sentence οὗς εἰκὼς ἦν κτλ. come after ἀδελφῶν.—I 6 read <καίτοι> τοῦτο γ' ἔρει . . . ἡμέτερον, and continue with πῶς οὐν περὶ τούτων . . . οὐκ εἰληφε; (from § 7), after which comes ἐν οἷς κτλ.—II, β 2, παρέχειν τὸ μὴ δ.—II, β 3, εἰς . . . προδῆλους <ἀτυχίας> ἐμπεσεῖν.—II, γ 5, πᾶς <δ> αὐτῶν . . . ἥλεγχεν ὅντα should follow πρᾶξιν ἦν.—III, γ 8, εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ <μηδενὸς δαίμονος> μηδὲ κτλ.—III, δ 1, after χρῆ something lost, viz., δόμοις ἀμφοῖν ἀκροᾶσθαι or, possibly, κάμοις ἀκροᾶσθαι.—III, δ 5, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀφεῖς <οὐκ> ἀν ἥμαρτε <τοῦ σκοποῦ>, μηδενὸς ὑπὸ τῷ βέλος ὑπελθόντος αὐτῷ.—IV, β 4 f., transpose § 5 to follow ὕπ' αὐτοῦ in 6, and, modifying Reiske's emendation, read ὑπό τε τοῦ ἄρχαντος τῆς πληγῆς <ὑπό τε τοῦ νόμου καθ' ὃν διώκομαι>; moreover, ἀβουλίᾳ (bis) in 6 should be ἀπιβουλῇ.—IV, β 7 (end), αὐτοὶ φονῆς corrupt, perhaps for ἀνατροπῆς.—IV, γ 4, transpose and read ἔστι δὲ η μὲν συμφορὰ τοῦ παθόντος, η δὲ ἀτυχία τ. π., as the emphasis rests on the second member.—IV, δ 5, ἀμαρτίας δίκαιος <φορεὺς> εἶναι ἔστιν (cf. τὰς ἀμαρτίας φέρειν in III, β 10. II).—IV, δ 10, ἀποκτείνας is corrupt, read δ τε γὰρ <ἀλιτήριος> τοῦ ἀποθανόντος.

Miscellen:—Paul Wolters (149-151) explains the ἀκοαί of IG IV 955 as mysterious sounds emanating from the precinct of Asclepius (cf. Marinus' life of Proclus 32, p. 79); but he concedes plausibility to Weinreich's suggestion in Athen. Mith. XXXVII (1912), p. 53, that ἀκοαί = aures, visibly represented (cf. Br. Keil in A. J. P. XXXV 487).—Fr. Leo (152-153) shows that the fragment of Satyrus' *βίος Εὐφρίδου* (fgmt. 9 Hunt) is a quotation of Hom. Od. 6 463-6; which exemplifies the futility of the attempts to restore mere shreds.—A. Schulten (153-154) discusses a passage from the mythographer Herodorus, enumerating the Iberian tribes along the straits of Gibraltar (F. H. G. II 34), and emends the corrupt ηδιοροδανος to read ἥδη ὁ πορθμός.—A. Stein (154-156) makes it probable that Heron of Alexandria in his *Oροι* (a suspected, but genuine work) addressed the Διονύσιε λαμπρότατε to M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius, who was prefect of Egypt 187/188 A. D., whereby we gain a definite date for Heron (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII 216).—F. Petersen (156-158) identifies in Flind. Petrie pap. II, p. 160, a fragment of the Hypsistopyle, included in no. XLIX c.—C. Robert (158-160) finds in one of the paintings of the domus aurea a represen-

tation of Ciris offering Minos the lock of her father's hair. He also identifies in the centre picture of the ceiling of the same room, where a triton, trumpet in hand, is drawing a wagon, the scene representing Poseidon and Amphitrite in the Munich frieze. It seems, however, that the Renaissance draughtsmen, on account of the indistinctness of the ancient paintings, blended the figures; the left leg of Amphitrite in the painting resembles that of Poseidon in the frieze.—F. Münzer (160) credits F. Rühl (Rh. M. LVI (1901), p. 511 f.) with the first recognition of the utilization of Xen. Cyrop. I 2, 1 in Tacitus II 88 (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 451 f.).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

BRIEF MENTION.

Omittance is no quittance. Looking over the last volume of the Journal I have noted several things that I would add, or would have otherwise, besides the errata pointed out XXXVIII 342 and the corrigenda recorded p. 462. E. g., p. 115, l. 3, the quotation from A. P. VII 429 has to do with a foolish conundrum $\phi\phi = \Phi\epsilon\delta\bar{\imath}s = \Phi\epsilon\delta\bar{\imath}s$ to which there is an English parallel in BB = Beebe. More apposite would be VII 128 which deals with Heraclitean tenebrisosity ('obscurity' is not the right word, A. J. P. XXIII 346): $\omega\chi\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\mu\nu\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\epsilon\bar{\pi}\nu\bar{\nu}\nu\bar{\nu}\nu$, $\tau\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\delta'\bar{\epsilon}'\mu'$ $\epsilon\bar{\pi}\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\bar{\nu}\nu\bar{\nu}\nu$.—P. 217, l. 8 from bottom, I prefer $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\rho}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\rho}$ $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\rho}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\rho}\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}$. Comp. Pind. O. 4, 19 with the commentators. Also Nonnus, Dionys. 3, 119 and Archil. 18: $\bar{\sigma}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\eta}\bar{\bar{\pi}}\bar{\tau}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\bar{\pi}}$ $\bar{\pi}\bar{\bar{\rho}}\bar{\bar{\lambda}}\bar{\bar{\lambda}}$ $\bar{\beta}\bar{\bar{\sigma}}\bar{\bar{\kappa}}\bar{\bar{\kappa}}\bar{\bar{\nu}}\bar{\bar{\nu}}$ $\bar{\beta}\bar{\bar{\epsilon}}\bar{\bar{\theta}}\bar{\bar{\eta}}$ $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\bar{\iota}}\bar{\bar{\iota}}\bar{\bar{\nu}}\bar{\bar{\nu}}$ $\bar{\delta}\bar{\bar{\epsilon}}\bar{\bar{\kappa}}\bar{\bar{\tau}}\bar{\bar{\tau}}$ $\bar{\Pi}\bar{\bar{\sigma}}\bar{\bar{\iota}}\bar{\bar{\iota}}\bar{\bar{\iota}}\bar{\bar{\iota}}$, a distich meant for a lady of Mrs. Warren's profession. The fig figure is familiar to every student of Aristophanes (Peace 1348): $\tau\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\kappa}$, $\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\delta}'\bar{\delta}'\bar{\delta}'$, and did not escape the prehensile nose of Browning who has expanded it outrageously in The Ring and the Book, Pompilia 821.

To go somewhat farther back in the same volume, the fanciful etymology of Lais (p. 71) was based, as I should have stated, on the Hebrew לְבִיא = *λέαινα* (Léonie) and was possibly suggested by the make-up of St. Paul's congregation at Corinth, in which *πορνεία* was an abhorred feature. Benfey thought of λάω, λῆμα. In the old days a 'fancy girl' would have been a fair equivalent,—but, after all, the old etymology from λαός is better. Conceived as the feminine of Laōs, which is being interpreted according to Wilamowitz (A. J. P. XXVI 241) Publius, Lais would be Publia, and Publia would sort very well with the familiar line: *Nemo ire quemquam publica prohibet via.* Lais by the way appears more than once among the imaginary sweethearts of Paulus—a liberty against which every right-feeling scholar must protest. The great names, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as Ewald emphasized long ago, do not reappear in Jewish history until the period of decline, and in like manner Lais and Phryne ought to have been sacrosanct in their line. Paulus' son-in-law, Agathias, seems to have had a better sense of propriety in dealing with

these improprieties and Laïs appears in one of his ἐπιτύμβια, a region in which I have been sojourning of late. It is a dangerous resort and some mischievous ghost has tempted me to play the part of a resurrectionist:

Ἐρπων εἰς Ἐφύρην τάφον ὕδρακον ἀμφὶ κέλευθος
Ἄστρος ἀρχαῖης, ὃς τὸ χάραγμα λέγει.
δάκρυν δὲ ἐπιστένας, "Χαῖροις, γύναι, ἐκ γὰρ ἀκοῦῆς
"οἰκτίρω σέ γ' ", ἔφη, "ἢ τάφος οὐκ ἔδομηρ.
"Α πόσον τιθέων νόον ἥκαχες· ἀλλ' ίσε Δῆθηρ
"ραλεῖς, ἀγλατην ἐν χθονὶ κατθεμένη."

As I was going to Ephyra, hard by the pathway I spied it
Tombstone of Laïs of old. This was the name that it bore.
Made a libation of tears, 'Hail, lady, though only from hearsay,
Yet I am woe for thee, thee whom I never have seen.
Ah! What pangs thou gavest the hearts of the springalds, but Lethe
Now is thy dwelling-place, down is thy brilliance in dust.'

Or thus :

One fine day	Ne'er did I
On my way	Thee espy,
To Ephyra,	Just by ear
There I saw	Held thee dear.
By the road	Still for thee
That I trod	Woe is me,
Laïs' tomb,	Thee, whose charm
Her of whom	Did such harm,
Ancient lore	Reft of joy
Witness bore.	Many a boy.
So on head-	Now dost dwell
Stone I read.	In Lethe's cell
Tears I shed	Neath earth's crust;
For the dead.	Naught but dust
Hail, I cried,	Is the glory
Women's pride,	Of thy story.

• I am as ready to hiss my staccato version—and the other too for the matter of that—as Charles Lamb was to hiss Mr. H., but the thing will serve to illustrate the difficulty of translating Greek into English so as to avoid padding. There are a number of intercalations in the verses, and yet the staccato rendering has not many more syllables than the 87 of the original. The Ephyra of the Greek I have retained. It is fashionable to substitute at will the more familiar equivalents, in this case Corinth (A. J. P. XXXVII 234), but the colour is lost and sometimes more than colour as I have remarked in my criticism of Cory's Heraclitus (A. J. P. XXXIII 112). 'Halicarnassian' and 'Carian' are not the same by any manner of means.

W. P. M.: *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494-1517)*. Par A. RENAUDET. Paris, Champion, 1916. Pp. 739. This important volume gives a detailed account of the religious and intellectual life at Paris during the quarter-century just preceding the Reformation. It sets forth, in annalistic order, the various attempts at reform within the Church itself, and it gives an excellent history of the spread of the New Learning in France. The great names of the period are Erasmus and Lefèvre d'Étaples, and the work of these two scholars is studied with especial care. But due attention is given also to Olivier Maillard and Jean Standonck and Robert Gaguin, to Fausto Andrelini and Josse Bade, to Girolamo Aleandro and Guillaume Budé, and to a great many other teachers and preachers of those days. Indeed, the book connects the humanistic movement in France with all the similar movements which were then going on in Italy, in England, in the Netherlands, and in Germany. It may be heartily commended to all students of the Renaissance.

R. V. D. M.: Our Bureau of American Ethnology under its competent chief W. H. Holmes—to whom a memorial volume has just been dedicated—has just issued two more annual reports and a bulletin. The 29th annual report (1907-8) contains a paper by J. P. HARRINGTON on *The Ethno-geography of the Tewa Indians* (pp. 27-636+21 plates+30 maps, un-paged). Sixty-four pages are devoted to the cosmography, meteorology, periods of time, and geographical terms of the Tewa Indians of the upper Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico. The rest of the paper is a treatment of Place-Names. The author's most important conclusion is that the Tewa have lived in the Rio Grande for a long time because so large a proportion of the place names are etymologically obscure. He also finds many geographical terms which are very precise in their description. Bulletin 55 (pp. XII+124) is a paper by W. W. ROBBINS, J. P. HARRINGTON, and BARBARA FREIRE-MARRECO entitled *Ethno-botany of the Tewa Indians*. There are two papers in the 30th annual report (1908-9). The first (pp. 31-102) is by MATILDA C. STEVENSON on the *Ethno-botany of the Zuñi Indians*, and the second (pp. 103-386) by W. E. ROTH on *An Inquiry into the Animism and Folk-lore of the Guiana Indians*. Mr. ROTH has already done valuable work in ethnography as Chief Protector of Aborigines in Queensland and as Royal Commissioner in Western Australia. The present paper is one of the by-products of seven years of work, in spare time, on the ethnography of the natives of the Pomeroon River in

British Guiana. One hundred and twenty-one myths and folk-tales are given to illustrate the beliefs of the Guiana Indians in regard to cults, creation, dreams, spirits, etc. There is no evidence that the Guiana Indians believed in a Supreme Being.

K. F. S.: *Lucreti De Rerum Natura libri sex, recognovit GVILELMVS Avgvstvs MERRILL.* Berkleiae, E Typographeo Vniversitatis, MDCCCCXVII. Pp. [4], 258. This edition of Lucretius was prepared by Professor MERRILL in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the University of California. The poem is divided into the proper rhetorical sections, sub-sections, etc. by a series of typographical devices which are explained and described in a brief introductory "Lectori monitum." Some of the more important sections are even indicated by special headings, such as *Colores non esse* (II, 755), *Plures imagines cur fiant* (IV, 327), etc. Otherwise this edition contains very little except the bare text. There are no prolegomena and, as is usually the case with all editions of Lucretius, there is no index of any sort. The apparatus criticus itself is largely confined to a record of variations from the vulgate. Many of these variations are incorporated in the text, and, so far as I can judge from a hasty examination, a good share of them are the editor's own conjectures to which he has already called attention in the third volume of Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Philol. now in progress. The number of these conjectures is so large that I should be inclined to view them with suspicion if their author were anyone else but Professor MERRILL. As it is, however, he is a sober and conservative critic and his well-deserved fame as a Lucretian scholar is such that one may well hesitate to differ with him. This is an unusually handsome text of a great Latin poet, it is beautifully printed, it is carefully edited by a scholar who is an authority. Professor MERRILL is to be congratulated upon this valuable contribution to classical scholarship.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristophanes. *The Archarnians*; as played by the Oxford University Dramatic Society; with tr. into English verse by Rob. Yelverton Tyrell. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1917. 83 pp., 8°, 40 c. net.

Armstrong (Mary Emma). *The Significance of Certain Colors in Roman Ritual*. Menasha, Wis., *G. Banta Pub.* 6 + 52 pp., 8°, pap., \$1 net.

Brewster (Ethel Hampson). *Roman Craftsmen and Tradesmen of the Early Empire*. Menasha, Wis., *G. Banta Pub.*, 1917. 14 + 101 pp., 8°, pap., \$1 net.

Chislett (W. Jr.). *The Classical Influence in English Literature in the 19th Century*; and other essays and notes. Boston, *Stratford & Co.* 15 + 150 pp., 12°, \$1.50 net.

Cicero. *Ciceronis Orationes pro Milone Caesarianae Philippicae recognovit A. C. Clark*. Ed. altera. Cr. 8°, 3s., interleaved, 7s., swd. 2s. 6d., on India paper w. *Orationes Rosc. Am., Imper. Pomp., Clu., Cat., Mur., Cael.*, recognovit A. C. Clark, 18s. 6d. (Oxford Classical Texts.) London, *Milford*, 1918.

Dante Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy*; the Italian text with a tr. in English blank verse by Courtney Langdon; and a commentary. V. I, *Inferno*. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard Univ.* 397 pp., 8°, \$2.50 net.

Dio Cocceianus (Cassius). *Dio's Roman History*; with an English tr. by Ernest Cary; on the basis of the version by Herb. Baldwin Foster, in 9 v. V. 6. New York, *Putnam*, 1917. 401 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net.

Ferrero (Guglielmo) and Barbagallo (Corrado). *A Short History of Rome*. V. I. *The Monarchy and the Republic*; from the foundation of the city to the death of Julius Caesar. 754 B. C.-44 B. C. New York, *Putnam*. 7 + 510 pp., 12°, \$1.90 net.

Gardner (P.). *A History of Ancient Coinage*, 700-399 B. C. 11 pl., 480 pp., 8°. 18s. net. \$7.20. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1918.

Kimball (Fiske) and Edgell (G. Harold). *A History of Architecture*. New York, *Harper*, 1918. 19 + 621 pp., il., figs., plans, 8°. (Harper's Fine Arts Ser.) \$3.50.

Lane (Timothy O'Neill). *Larger English-Irish Dictionary*. New York, *Funk & Wagnalls*. 174 pp., 8°, \$7.50 net.

Lutz (H. F.). *Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa*. 57 pl., Demy 4°, 56 pp., 21s. net. (Yale Oriental Ser.: *Babylonian Texts*.) London, *Milford*, 1918.

McLemore (Ja. Sugars). *The Tradition of the Latin Accent*. Charlottesville, Va., *Univ. of Va.*, 1917. 96 pp., 4°, pap., 75 c.

Macdonnell (Arth. Anthony). *A Vedic reader for students*; containing thirty hymns of the Rig Veda in the original Samhita and

Pada texts, with transliteration, translation, explanatory notes, introd. and vocabulary. New York, *Oxford Univ.*, 1917. 31 + 263 pp., 12°, \$3.40 net.

Macmillan Co., Editorial Dept. Notes for the Guidance of Authors; on the preparation of manuscripts, on the reading of proofs, and on dealing with publishers. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900-1918. 11 + 64 pp., 12°, pap., 50 c. net.

Murray (Sir Ja. A. H.) and others. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society (Oct. pt. of V. 9). Stillation-Stratum. New York, *Oxford Univ.* 961-1088 pp., f., bds., \$2.

Merrill (W. A.) Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil. Berkeley, Cal., *Univ. of Cal.* 135-247 pp., 8°. (Pubs. in Classical Philology, V. 3, No. 3.) Pap., \$1.25.

— Parallelisms and Coincidences in Lucretius and Ennius. Berkeley, Cal., *Univ. of Cal.* 249-264 pp., 8°. (Pubs. in Classical Philology, V. 3, No. 4.) Pap., 20 c.

Plutarch. Select Essays. Vol. II. From "The Moralia" transl. w. introd., notes, and appendices, by A. O. Prickard. 8°, 336 pp., 3s. 6d. net. (Oxford translations.) New York, *Milford*, 1918.

— Plutarch's Lives: with an English tr. by Bernadotte Perrin. In 11 v. V. 5. Agesilaus and Pompey, Pelopidas and Marcellus. New York, *Putnam*, 1917. 9 + 543 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net.

Seneca (Lucius Annaeus). Seneca's Morals; by way of abstract to which is added a discourse under the title of an afterthought by Sir Roger L'Estrange. Centennial ed. New York, *Harper*, 1917. 373 pp., facsms., 8°, \$10. (750 copies.)

Tarbell (Fk. Bigelow). Three Etruscan painted sarcophagi. Chicago, *Field Mus. of Nat. Hist.*, 1917. 63-71 pp., il. pls., 8°. (Anthropological Ser. V. 6, No. 4.) Pap., 50 c.

Valloy (C. Amzi). Studies on the Athena Parthenos of Pheidias. Iowa City, Ia., *Univ. of Ia.*, 1917. 357 pp., front., 8°. (Humanistic Studies, V. I, No. 5.) Pap., 50 c.

Venkatarama (Ayyar, C. P.). Town-planning in ancient Dekkan; with an introd. by Patrick Geddes. New York, *G. E. Stechert*. (n. d.) 21 + 199 pp., il. pls., 12°, \$1.50 net.

Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language; based on the International Dictionary of 1890 and 1900; now completely revised in all departments, including also a dictionary of geography and biography; being the latest authentic quarto edition of the Merriam series. Springfield, Mass., *G. & C. Merriam Co.*, 1918. 92 + 2620 pp., il. pls. (part col., part double), \$14.

FRENCH, ITALIAN, SPANISH.

Festa (Nicola). Edipo a Colono: saggio di studi sofoclei. Firenze, tip. *E. Ariani*, 1917. 8°, 49 pp. (Estr. Atene e Roma.)

Frati (Carlo). Le traduzioni aristoteliche di G. Argiropulo e un'antica legatura medicea. Firenze, *L. S. Olschki* (tip. Giuntina), 1917. 8°, 27 pp. (Estr. La Bibliofilia.)

Gsell (Stéphane). Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord. Tome II. L'Etat carthaginois. Tome III. Histoire militaire de Carthage. 2 vols. in-8, *Hachette*. Chaque volume 12 fr.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Opera omnia, scholarum in usum ad optimarum editionum fidem castigavit, recensuit C. Fumagalli. Editio

sexta. Romae-Napoli-Mediolani, *Albrighti, Segati et Soc.*, 1918. 16°, XXVIII, 232 pp., 1.50 L. (*Scriptorum Romanorum bibliotheca.*)

Larousse. *Dictionnaire illustré de la langue française.* Ouvrage extrait du "Larousse élémentaire illustré" publié sous la direction de Claude et Paul Augé. In-16°, 5.40 fr.

Oncken (Guillermo). *Historia Universal escrita parcialmente por profesores especialistas; nueva edición revisada y puesta al dia.* Tomo II. *Historia de Babilonia y Asiria* por el Dr. Federico Hommel, un vol. en 4° de 542 páginas, con fotograbados, encuadrado en tela. 7 Ptas. Tomo III. *Historia de la India antigua*, por el doctor S. Lefmann, un vol. en 4° de 446 páginas, con fotograbados, encuadrado en tela. 7 Ptas.

Pais (Ettore). *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto: indagini storiche, epigrafiche, giuridiche.* Roma, *A. Nardocchia*, 1918. 8°, 2 voll. (xii, 762 pp.), con undici tavole, 30 L.

Platone, L'Assioco: dialogo subditivo, con note del dott. Giulio Antonibon. Torino, *G. B. Paravia e C.*, 1917. 16°, xv, 83 pp., 1.80 L. (*Biblioteca scolastica di scrittori greci*, No. 31.)

Prosa e poesia greca: letture pei ginnasi e pei licei (a cura di) C. Tincani. Quarta edizione, corretta ed accresciuta. Torino, casa ed. E. Loescher (*V. Bona*), 1917. 8°, xiii, 416 pp., 3.50 L.

Ramorino (Felice). *Sintassi della lingua latina, con esercizi e temi, ad uso della quarta e quinta classe ginnasiale.* Napoli, *F. Perrella* (Città di Castello, *Soc. Leonardo da Vinci*), 1917. 8°, xii, 350 pp., 3.50 L.

Reinach (Salomon). *Catalogue illustré du Musée des antiquités nationales au château de Saint-Germain-en-Laye.* Tome I. In-8, 296 pp., avec 1 pl. et 286 grav. *E. Leroux*. 9 fr.

Vincent (Carlo). *Moliere imitatore di Plauto e di Terenzio.* Roma, tip. dell' Autore, 1917. 16°, 118 pp.

Vives y Escudero (Antonio). *Estudio de arqueología cartaginesa. La Necrópoli de Ibiza;* un vol. en 4° mayor de 189 pags., con fotograbados. 20 Ptas.

SWISS AND GERMAN.

Bibliothekskataloge. *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz.* Hrsg. von der Koeniglich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Muenchen. Bd. I: *Die Bistuemer Konstanz & Chur.* Bearb. von Paul Lehmann. Mit 1 Karte. xx + 599 S. gr. 8°. Muenchen, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchh.*, 1918. 36 m.

Hauser (Carl). *Grammatik der griechischen Inschriften Lykiens.* Diss. Phil. I. Univ. Zuerich. iv + 160 S. 8°. Basel, *E. Birkhaeuser*, 1916.

Liechtenhan (Eduard). *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Marcellus Empiricus.* Diss. Phil. Basel. viii + 119 S. 8°. Basel, *Werner-Riehm*, 1917.

Oesch (Jacob). *Die Vergleiche bei Dio Chrysostomus.* Diss. Phil. I. Univ. Zuerich. iv, 103 S. 8°. Aarau, *H. R. Sauerlaender & Co.*, 1916.

Olivier (Frank). *Les Epodes d'Horace.* iv + 163 pp., 8°. Lausanne, Paris, *Payot & Cie.*, 1917. 5 fr.

Wackernagel (Jacob). *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer.* iv + 264 S. 8°. Goettingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1916. 8.60 m. (*Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik*, hrsg. von Paul Kretschmer und Wilhelm Kroll, Heft 4.)

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Albright (W. F.) Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. Reprinted from *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, January, 1918.

Athenaeum. Studii periodici di letteratura e storia. Direttore Carlo Pascal. Anno V, fasc. IV, ottobre 1917. Pavia, *Athenaeum*.

Beardslee (John Walter, Jr.) The Use of ΦΤΣΙΣ in Fifth-century Greek Literature. Chicago dissertation. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1918.

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. Proceedings. Vol. XL. Part 1. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1918.

Gaidoz (H.) Deux Érudits Gallois: John Rhys et Llywarch Reynolds. (Extraits de la Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement 1916.) Paris, Société de l'Enseignement Supérieur, 1917.

Hyde (Walter Woodburn). The Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Winckelmann. Chicago, London, *The Open Court Publishing Company*, 1918. (Reprinted from the *Monist*.)

Jewish Quarterly Review. The New Series. Vol. VIII. No. 4, April, 1918. Philadelphia, Pa. Published quarterly by the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1918.

Inter-América. Vol. I, Nos. 5, 6. Vol. II, No. 1. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*, 1918.

Journal of Philology (The). Vol. XXXIV, No. 68. London, *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.*; Cambridge, *Bowes & Bowes, Deighton, Bell & Co., Ltd.*, 1918. 4s. 6d.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 37, Part 4, December, 1917. New Haven, Conn., *Yale University Press*.

Merrill (Elmer Truesdell). Some Remarks on Cases of Treason in the Roman Commonwealth. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XIII, No. 1, January, 1918.

— Tertullian on Pliny's Persecution of Christians. Reprinted from *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. XXII, No. 1, January, 1918.

Mnemosyne. *Bibliotheca philologica Batava. Nova Series*. Vol. XLV, Pars 4. Vol. XLVI, Pars I. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill*, 1917.

Oxford English Dictionary. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, Henry Bradley, etc. Vol. IX. Si-St. Stillation-Stratum. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1917. \$2.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXV. Num. 3. Noviembre y Diciembre de 1917.

Slaughter (Gertrude). Two Children in Old Paris. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1918. \$1.50.

Smith (K. F.) Recollections of an Old Johns Hopkins Student. (Reprinted from *The Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, Vol. VI, No. 3, March, 1918.)

Stonecipher (Alvin H. M.) Graeco-Persian Names. New York [etc.], *American Book Company*, [1918]. (The Vanderbilt Oriental Series. Vol. IX.)

Van Hamel (A. G.) *Zeventiende-eeuwsche opvattingen en theorieën over litteratuur in Nederland*. 's-Gravenhage, *Martinus Nijhoff* 1918. 4.20 Gld.

White (Edward Lucas). *The Unwilling Vestal*. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Company*, [1918]. \$1 50.

Whitford (Robert C.) *Madame de Staël's Literary Reputation in England*. University of Illinois, 1918. (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Lang. and Literature. Vol. IV, No. 1.)

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX, 3.

WHOLE NO. 155.

I.—THE APOCRYPHAL¹ SIR THOMAS MORE AND THE SHAKESPEARE HOLOGRAPH.

I.

The recent Tercentenary Commemoration of Shakespeare's death has brought forth at least two important works that lay claim to the immediate attention of critics and scholars. The one is a monumental collaboration of thirty-nine expert antiquaries who, under the direction of Sir Sidney Lee, undertook to reconstruct the daily life and interests of the English people during the life-time of the poet. Shakespeare's England² contains forty-nine chapters, each written by an acknowledged authority. Sir Walter Raleigh sketches the Elizabethan Age, Dr. Bradley writes on Shakespeare's English, Sir John Sandys on the Education and Scholarship of the times. The section devoted to Handwriting, by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, pp. 284–310, has in turn given birth to the other work of consequence, Shakespeare's Handwriting.³ In this study the ingenious theory of the late Richard Simpson, to the effect that in the well-known addition to the manuscript play of Sir Thomas More, extant in the Harleian MS. 7368 of the British Museum,

¹ "The epithet 'pseudo-Shakespearean' no longer carries with it any presumption as to Shakespeare's authorship. Certain plays, a baker's dozen in all, have acquired a prescriptive right to the title, and must be mentioned in every list."—C. F. T. Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, Oxford, 1908, p. vii.

² 2 vols., Oxford, 1916.

³ 4to, pp. xii, 64, Oxford, 1916.

we have a specimen of Shakespeare's autograph composition, receives what is intended to be the final and definitive confirmation. Sir E. M. Thompson's monograph, however, is a strictly diplomatic study, and does not take into account that, in this case at least, criticism of a literary nature cannot, to any extent, be eschewed, because the penmanship of the manuscript folios is inextricably bound up with the workmanship of the scenes which they embrace. A new investigation of the entire question has therefore been undertaken in these pages, which aims not only at a control—and amplification—of the palaeographical evidences adducible from the manuscript leaves but also at a reasonable comprehensiveness of the literary material in question.¹

Sir Thomas More, in the transmitted form, consists of the original wrapper,—which constitutes folios 1 and 2,—of thirteen original leaves, fols. 3–5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17–22,—which comprise about two-thirds of the whole,—of seven additional folios, 6–9, 12, 13, 16, and, since 1910, when W. W. Greg was permitted to detach the two cancelling slips of paper from fols. 11^b and 14^a, of two more folios, 11^{*} and 13^{*}. Folios 6^b, 9^b, 11^{*a}, 13^{*b} and 22^b being blank, the actual number of manuscript pages is thirty-nine.²

They were not issued until 1844, when A. Dyce transcribed and published the play in behalf of the Shakespeare Society.³

¹ After the completion of the investigation the writer conferred with Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum, the genial psychanalyst and Shakespeare scholar, of New York. Some of his suggestions are here incorporated under the index (S. A. T.).

² The present description is made on the basis of a full-sized photographic facsimile of the manuscript, *The Book of Sir Thomas Moore* <Harleian MSS. 7368, c. 1590–96>, London. Issued for subscribers by the Editor of the Tudor Facsimile Texts (John S. Farmer), 1910, vi p. facs.: 38p. 39x26 cm. (Library of Congress press-mark, PR 2750, B 68, 1910.) There exists also a Students' reprint of the latter, by John S. Farmer, pub. Amersham, England, 1914. 38p. 34½ cm. Comparison was naturally made with the account by W. W. Greg in *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, The Malone Society Reprints, 1911, which contains facsimiles of fols. 3^a, 6^a, 7^a, 9^a, 12^a, 13^b and 22^a. By a strange oversight Dr. Greg has omitted mention of fols. 22^a and 22^b on p. xxvii of his schematic analysis. The best reproduction of fols. 8^a, 8^b and 9^a is to be found in Thompson's *Shakespeare's Handwriting*, pp. 32 ff.

³ No. 23, pp. xxiii, 3, 102.

Nine years later this edition was reprinted by Thomas Amyot.¹ Hopkinson's modernized edition, London, 1902, intended for private circulation, is not generally accessible, but the division of the play into acts and scenes, first indicated by him, has been retained by C. F. Tucker Brooke in his edition.² The student of Sir Thomas More, however, will find himself in a totally helpless condition when endeavoring to make use of this book in conjunction with W. W. Greg's *The Book of Sir Thomas More*,³—for, while the former is divided according to Hopkinson's system, and represents a compromise between the original and the revised text, the latter prints, in the transmitted form, all of the original leaves first, with the lines in consecutive numbering, and then the additions by themselves, as they occur in the manuscript, the entire play being divided into scenes and not into acts as well. For the convenience of investigators, a comparative tabulation of the two systems on the basis of the folio-notation, such as is attached to the present study, Table I (p. 233), will be found to be indispensable.⁴

The manuscript is shot thru with alterations and deletions,—whole scenes have been marked for omission, misplaced or re-written,—and, what is most important, it shows distinct evidence of the collaboration of several hands, both in the calligraphic and in the literary sense. Such composite authorship is not infrequent in the Elizabethan drama. Thus, for instance, the abbreviated names of five different writers are appended to the five acts of the printed text of *The Tragedy of Tancred and Gismund*, 1591/2,⁵ viz. Rod. Staf(ford), Hen. No(el), G. Al., Ch. Hat(ton) and R. Wil(mot), the whole being revised by the last-named dramatist, as we are quaintly advised on the title-page, in accordance with "the decorum of these daies". MSS. Lansdowne 786 and Hargrave 205 of the

¹ A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays, v. 3, London, 1853.

² The Shakespeare Apocrypha, Oxford, 1908, pp. 385-437.

³ Malone Society Reprints, London, 1911.

⁴ We follow Greg's division, but not his views on the authorship and extent of the additions. Similarly must we register our disapprobation of Dr. Greg's contemptuous reference, p. xxv, to Tucker Brooke's introduction, which is reasonably accurate, and eminently satisfactory for the general reader it was intended to reach.

⁵ Malone Society Reprints, 1914.

play give no indication to this effect. Henslowe's Diary¹ is a good source for such information. But for the item of 16 Oct 99 to the effect that Anthony Munday, Michael Drayton, Robert Wilson and Thomas Hathaway received payment for *The Life of Sir John Oldcastle*, we might be persuaded to lend credence to the late and spurious note on the edition of 1600 which makes Shakespeare the original author. The custom of joint-authorship permitted more than even four persons collaborating upon a single piece. Henslowe, for 22 May 1602, lists five men, Dekker, Drayton, Middleton, Munday and Webster, as joint authors of *Caesar's Fall*, and the same men for the same year are responsible also for *The Two Harpies*. There is, then, nothing unusual in the composite workmanship of *Sir Thomas More*, the aim having been, no doubt, to prepare the play for the stage with a maximum of despatch.

This point is best brought out in the discussion of the varied types of handwriting found in the manuscript. One of the hands, clearly that of the Master of the Revels, 'E^d Tyllney', (so signed),² met with not only in marginal directions but also on the first leaf of the play, records his objection to the Insurrection Scene, which must have sounded seditious and inappropriate to his ears, "Leave out ye Insurrection wholy & ye Cause ther off." Brooke maintains³ that the play was submitted to Sir Edmund Tilney in the original form of thirteen leaves, and that the number of hands concerned in the work and the consequent disorder therein are due to the haste of the manager, anxious to stage his play in order to comply with the demands of the censor. This interpretation in itself, would be no exaggeration of the evidence. Another play may here be submitted which might form an exact parallel to such a view of *Sir Thomas More*. The Second Maiden's Tragedy⁴ was

¹ Shakespeare Society, vol. 7, 1854. Cf. also the very serviceable Commentary to the Diary, by Dr. Greg, II, London, 1908.

² The form given by Dr. Greg, p. 1, as 'E Tyllney' does not correspond with the manuscript.

³ Op. cit. Introd. p. xl ix.

⁴ Malone Society Reprints, 1909. Also, Dodsley's Old English Plays, ed. Hazlitt, v. X. The verso of the last leaf, MS. Lansdowne 807, sets down for the author, successively, Thomas Goff, George Chapman and 'By Will Shaksper'. Cf. also Modern Language Notes, xxvii, pp. 33 ff.

TABLE I

An analysis of Sir Thomas More on the basis of folio notation, showing a comparison between the scene division of Greg and the act division of Henderson and Brooke.

GREG			BROOKE		
Folio	Line	Scene	Act	Scene	Line
3 ^a , 3 ^b	1-103	1	I	1	1-177
3 ^b , 4 ^a , 4 ^b	104-312	2		2	1-207
5 ^a , 5 ^b	314-409	3		3	1-94
5 ^b	410-452	4		(First sketch of II, 2, omitted by Dyce, Henderson and Brooke)	
5 ^b	453-472*	5	II	1	1-30
(Addition I)				Appendix, later draft of IV, 5, 68	
6 ^a	1-71	13	(cf. fol. 19 ^a)		
(Addition II)					
7 ^a	1-65**	4		2	1-85
7 ^b	66-120~	5 ^a		3	1-58
8 ^a , 8 ^b , 9 ^a	121-270&	6		4	1-172
10 ^a , 10 ^b	473-565	6			173-273
10 ^b , 11 ^a , 11 ^b	566-734	7	III	4	1-180
11 ^b	735-796>	8 ^a		1	
(Addition III)			Appendix, first draft of III, 2, 23		
12 ^{ab}	1-22	8		2	1-21
(Addition IV)				2	22-322
13 ^a and b, 13 ^a and b	1-242<	8			
(Addition V)				3	1-22
13 ^{aa}	1-26~~	8 ^a			
14 ^a	797-876	8b	Appendix, first draft of III, a, 91		
14 ^a , 15 ^a , 15 ^b	878-1118	9	IV	1	1-257
(Addition VI)*					
16 ^a , 16 ^b	1-73	9 ^a			
Of this	1-20			1	310-329
	21-35		Appendix, first draft of IV, 1, 330		
	36-67		1	330-358	
	68-73		Not printed by Dyce and Brooke		
17 ^a	1119-1158	9		1	258-309
17 ^a , 17 ^b , 18 ^a	1159-1281	10		2	1-119
18 ^a , 18 ^b	1282-1379	11		3	1-95
18 ^b	1380-1410	12		4	1-29
18 ^b , 19 ^a and b, 20 ^a	1411-1602	13**		5	1-189
	(cf. fol. 6 ^a)				
20 ^a	1603-1674	14	V	1	1-69
20 ^b	1675-1727	15		2	1-67
20 ^b , 21 ^a , 21 ^b	1728-1860	16		3	1-134
21 ^b , 22 ^a	1861-1987	17		4	1-138
Of this	1956-64		Appendix, first draft of V, 4, 115		

FOOTNOTES:—*Marked for cancelling. **Elaboration of sc. 4 on fol. 5^b. ~ Revision of a lost portion of sc. 5. & Revision of an original, part of which is lines 476-565 on fol. 10, so that ll. 473-5 being marked for omission, l. 476 follows upon l. 270. > Lines 761-796 until lately covered by fol. 11*. <Marked to replace sc. 8^a on 11^b. From l. 212 on a different hand. Brooke, l. 283. ~~Lines 9-26 were pasted over ll. 849-876 of 14^a. *Lines 1-67 are to be inserted between IX and X on 17^a. Lines 68-73 represent the first draft of the opening of viiiia on 13^a. **Lines 1471-1516, marked for omission, are to be replaced by Addition I on fol. 6^a.

licensed for the stage by Sir George Buc, nephew and successor of Tilney, 31 Oct 1611. Here, too, we find a proviso that certain reformations indicated should be accomplished before the public presentation, and accordingly we find that five of the twenty-seven folios are in four different hands and contain additions and alterations. However, in Sir Thomas More the refractory insurrection scene is merely recast, not omitted; the first scene, the cause of the riots, to which the censor took exception,¹ is left unaltered; nor is there any record that the play was actually staged. Payne Collier's unsupported assumption that Laneham acted in Sir Thomas More² is just as unwarranted as Fleay's bold statement under the year 1596,³ "The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More was certainly acted in this year." Preference must therefore be given to Dr. Greg's theory, p. xiv, that the additions were already in the manuscript when it was submitted for license, and that the play was not produced because compliance with the censor's objections would have proved fatal to a success on the stage. It may be added that the note to "Enter A Messenger" on the top of fol. 13 * *, sc. viii *, viz. "Mess T Goodal", need not indicate more than that Goodal, one of Lord Strange's men in Shakespeare's company,⁴ was tentatively designated for the rôle of the messenger. Since the appearance of his name in the extant cast of the Seven Deadly Sins for 1592 has been used to determine the date of More as of the same year, this possibility must be kept in mind when we come to the discussion of the date of the play.

The thirteen original leaves have been assigned by all critics to one definite hand. Not typically a scribe's handwriting, it is nevertheless regular and characteristic enough to play no part in the palaeographical confusion. As in the case of Tilney, however, so here, too, we have other important considerations connected with the calligraphy; at this point, that of the author-

¹ For the broader aspects of the censorship, cf. V. C. Gildersleeve, Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama, Diss., Columbia Univ., New York, 1908, p. 55 et al.

² Shakespeare, i, cix, apud Greg, p. xx.

³ A Chron. Hist. of the Life and Work of Wm. Shakespeare, Lond. 1886, p. 292.

⁴ Fleay, A Chron. Hist. of the London Stage, London, 1890, p. 84.

ship of the play, as a whole, or, rather, as represented by the thirteen folios. The former aspect of the question is discernible in the attitude of at least two scholars. Fleay assigns the play, as a whole, to Thomas Lodge, "but this depends on the correctness of my identification of Lodge with Philomusus in *The Return from Parnassus*."¹ Elsewhere, too, he supports Lodge's authorship;² but it is noteworthy, with respect to the preceding paragraph, that here he decides for 1594 as the year of the performance. However, in *Biog. Chron.* I, 138, he prefers, "more or less conjecturally", Michael Drayton!

Hopkinson may be recorded in agreement with Fleay as to Lodge.³ On the other hand, J. A. Symonds is inclined to see in the play "the style of Heywood in the making".⁴

However, the consideration of the authorship of the original leaves alone has led to more definite results. Brooke, p. xlviii, maintained that we have here "a clean copy, made perhaps not by the author himself, but by a professional scribe." Nor did Greg believe that the original folios of the play represented an autograph composition, but placed himself on record to the effect that "supposing the original text to be the work of a single author, and supposing that author's hand to occur anywhere in the extant manuscript, then the evidence points to that hand being *B*" (p. xviii; the hand found only on fols. 7^a and 16^a of the additions). Subsequent events showed that his diagnosis of the case was incorrect.⁵ For a recent identification of the handwriting in Sir Thomas More with the signed collotype autograph of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, 1596, (in *The Tudor Facsimile Texts*), as well as with the introductory pages of Munday's *Heaven of the Mind*, 1602, (Brit. Mus. Add. 33384), has established quite conclusively the penmanship, at least, of the original folios.⁶ In a later state-

¹ A Biographical Chron. of the English Drama, II, Lond. 1892, p. 312. Also Life and Work of Shakespeare, p. 292.

² Chron. Hist. London Stage, p. 154.

³ Introduction to his edition of Sir Thomas More, Lond. 1902.

⁴ Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama. New ed., London, 1900. Pages 296 ff., 332 ff., 350 ff. are of interest.

⁵ Mention is made of the circumstance because his correlation (pp. xvi-xix) of the various hands of the MS. is thus deprived of most of its meaning and force.

⁶ Thompson, Shakespeare's Handwriting, p. xii.

ment, Greg placed¹ the hand in More midway in date between the other two autographs. That Munday was perhaps also the author of the pages, and not a mere copyist, is immaterial to the actual subject-matter of this discussion. Anthony Munday, 1553-1633,² actor, priest-baiter, author, spy, embezzler, pageantier and balladist, had a lack of originality which, for collaborative purposes, agrees well with the present requirement. He seems to have been concerned in 18 plays and, from the accounts of Henslowe's Diary, to have laid Chettle, Drayton, Hathaway, Wilson, Dekker, Middleton and Webster under contribution.³ There seems also to be a definite allusion to Munday in the play, altho not in his handwriting. Addition II, top of fol. 7^b, we read, "Att an other doore S^r Iohn Munday Hurt." Sir John has been wounded by the prentices. Such allusions are by no means infrequent in Elizabethan drama,⁴ but they must be used only in connection with other corroborative material. Anthony Munday, then, may be accepted, for our working purposes, as the author of *Sir Thomas More*. One of his collaborators, at least, seems to have been recognized, by a comparison of fol. 13^b, lower half, (the sole occurrence of the hand), with other extant manuscripts, to be Thomas Dekker.⁵ Dekker's, we have seen before, is one of the joint authors' names which we compiled from Henslowe.

Two more hands can without difficulty be added to the above elimination. They are the distinctive features found on fols. 6^a and 7^a, 16^{a&b}, respectively. They resemble none of the other specimens and are seen nowhere else, save that the writer of the latter set appears also in the marginal additions

¹ Mod. La. Review, viii (1913), 89.

² Cf. Dict. of Nat. Biography, xxxix, 290 ff.

³ Southey described his translation of the *Palmerin of England* as the "Grub Street Patriarch's worst piece of work", and Ben Jonson ridiculed him in his earliest play, *The Case is Altered*, 1599, as Antonio Balladino, 'in print for the best plotter'.

⁴ Cf. *Wily Beguiled*, 1606 (Malone Society Reprints, 1912), where the Prologue is addressed by the Juggler as 'humorous George'—one of the circumstantial arguments for George Peele's authorship of the play.

⁵ W. W. Greg and Sir George Warner, late Keeper of MSS. at the British Museum, apud Greg, pp. ix and x. The MSS. are Brit. Mus. Add. 30262, fol. 66^b and Henslowe's Diary, fols. 101 and 114 at Dulwich College.

to the original Munday pages. The question of their authorship is undecided, and unimportant for our present purposes. A glance at Table II (pp. 238 f.) will reveal the fact that the problem has now been narrowed down to the handwriting of only a comparatively small number of folios, viz. 7^b, 8^{a & b}, 9^a, 11^{* b}, 12^{a & b}, 13^a, the upper half of 13^b, and 13^{* a}, with already five hands accounted for. According to Brooke, p. xvii, the manuscript was written in five different hands, "possibly only four. . . . According to Dr. Furnivall there are clearly six, and perhaps seven." If these scholars refer solely to the hands actually at work upon the literary make-up of the play and do not include either the censor Tilney's corrections or the large formal type of the title on the wrapper, it is difficult to see what divisional lines they could consistently set up. Dr. Greg, p. vii, distinguishes seven specimens inclusive of that of the Master of the Revels; that is to say, six actual collaborators. Clearly, then, the question has assumed a more complicated aspect since the time when the late Richard Simpson, acknowledging the total absence of contemporary evidence,¹ assigned the scenes corresponding to fols. 7^b, 8^{a & b}, 9^a, 12^{a & b} and 13^{a & b} to the skill *and* pen of Shakespeare, and recognized, besides the writer responsible for the thirteen original leaves, only two other variant autographs. Spedding, the noted Bacon-scholar, who soon became interested in the new 'Shakespeare discovery', was able to discern one more, *i. e.* five distinct calligraphies and, giving a doubtful value to fol. 13^b (scene viii, 212-242, the Dekker hand of Greg's later system), was the first to isolate, as Shakespeare's, the three pages, 8^a, 8^b and 9^a (scene vi, 123-270), which form the pivotal point of Sir E. M. Thompson's recent investigation.²

¹ "Are There Any Extant MSS. in Shakespeare's Handwriting?", pp. 1-3, Notes and Queries, Ser. iv, vol. viii, 1871.

² "Shakespeare's Handwriting", pp. 227 ff.; iv, Notes and Queries, x, 1872. Of this we read in an interesting passage in Alfred Lord Tennyson, *A Memoir by his Son*, (New York, 1897, ii, 291), "Spedding insisted that Shakespeare, among the many plays he edited for the stage, had corrected a play on Sir Thomas More in the British Museum. It is a poor play, but Spedding believed that the corrections were possibly in Shakespeare's actual handwriting." This private glimpse, gained from Tennyson's words, shows that Spedding's theory was by no means put forth with full assurance.

TABLE II
A comparison of scholarly opinion as to the scope and distribution of the various specimens of handwriting in the text of
Sir Thomas More.

(The original indices are retained!)

Folio	3 ^a b, 4 ^a b, 5 ^a b	6 ^a	7 ^a	7 ^b	8 ^a , 8 ^b , 9 ^a	10 ^a b, 11 ^a b	11 ^a b
Simpson	Hand A	Add. I.			Addition Two.		Add. III.
		Hand B	C		Shakespeare's autograph composition, Henderson's Act II, sc. 3 and 4, 1-172. Hand D	Hand A	Hand D
Spedding	Hand A	Hand B	C	D	Shakespeare's hand. Hand E	Hand A	Hand D Spedding's index!
		Hand A	Only here.	C II, 2.	Shakespeare's, as in Simpson. Henderson's II, 3 and 4, 1-172. Hand D	Hand A II, 173-273; III, 1, 2, 23.	Hand D III, 2, -21.
Brooke	Hand A Henderson's I, 1, 2, 3, and II, 1.	Hand B			Opinion also of Mr. Herbert of the British Mus.		
		Hand A	Greg's index! sc. 13.	B	C	Hand D	
Greg	Sc. 1-5.	Scribe, S			Greg's author of the Play! sc. 4, 1-65.	sc. 4a.	Hand C sc. 6-8a.

TABLE II—Continued

Folio	12 ^a b, 13 ^a , 13 ^b	13 ^a	14 ^a b, 15 ^a b	16 ^a , 16 ^b	17 ^a b to 22 ^a	Remark
Simpson	Addition IV.	Add. V.	A	C	Hand A	
	D, Shakespeare. Act III, sc. 2.	Hand D III, 3.	his D III, 3.	Hand A	C	Hand A
Spedding	his Hand D, III, 1-282. From 283 to end, perhaps Hand E, Shakespearian.	D	III, 2, and IV, 1.	A	IV, 1,	Hand A
Brooke	III, 2, 22-282 is Hand D; that of the poet. Lines 263-322 is Hand E, only here.				C IV, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; V, 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Greg	Hand C, as far as sc. 8, 1-181 and 182-211 on 13 ^b ; but 212-end is Hand E, his Dekker hand.	C sc. 8a.	Hand S sc. 8b and 9.	B sc. 9a.	Hand S sc. 10-17.	

There has been, then, a decided lack of unanimity over the fixation of the mooted Shakespearian addition. This circumstance, in itself, is far from incriminating ; it is, however, significant enough not to be omitted from any complete record of the case ; it acquires added meaning in combination with other available testimony.

Thompson's procedure, in one vitally important respect, falls short of the scope set before him by Spedding. The latter posited, and very properly, two leading questions, 1. Does the workmanship of the part under discussion bear internal evidence that Shakespeare was the workman ? 2. Does the penmanship bear internal evidence that the penman was the author ? If the first question necessitated a negative decision, then, he held, the second could offer no interest at all. Thompson's monograph, content to rest on the favorable *impressions* of a few literary critics, confines itself, as we have before said, solely to the matter of palaeographical evidence. His high authority in such a province is in itself an earnest of careful and conscientious research ; his testimony as an expert in handwriting should but receive confirmation when subjected to rigid checks.

II.

If we were acquainted with the kind of hand Shakespeare wrote, it would be comparatively easy to discover what words or passages he wrote. As a matter of fact, however, there are extant only six authentic signatures of the poet, no two of them spelled alike, altho each seemingly conforming to a pronunciation which would be represented by the French words *chaque espère*.¹ These signatures, well-known to Shakespeare students, are affixed, respectively, to three certificates and to the poet's last will. For the sake of present convenience as well as of later discussion, they may be divided as follows: Group I. a) Affidavit, 11 May 1612, b) Bill of Sale, 10 March 1613, c) Mortgage Deed, 11 March 1613, Group II. a) b) c) one signed to each of the three sheets of the Will, 25 March 1616. Professor C. W. Wallace of Nebraska, who discovered the 1612 autograph, in an article

¹ The poet's name is capable of permissible permutations running into the thousands. Cf. Wise, Autograph of W. S. . . . 4000 ways of spelling the name, 1869.

written in 1910¹ declares for the genuineness also of the abbreviated "W^m. Sh^e"² in the Aldine Ovid's Metamorphoses, and recently, on his lecture tour,³ gave the impression of accepting, besides the most likely authentic signature⁴ inscribed in a copy of Florio's translation of Montaigne's Essays, 1603, one in Warner's Albion's England, 1612, one in each of the volumes of Pliny's A Historie of the World, 1602, and one in Bartholomaeus Anglicus, De proprietatibus rerum, 1597. There may be peculiar and fresh evidences for recognizing the validity of these new specimens,—the latter signatures are especially referred to, since the Ovid signature is palpably a clumsy tracing of IIc,—but it seems to be the opinion of many scholars⁵ that all the signatures save the six above enumerated are to be repudiated. (There is, besides, in the possession of E. Hawkins of Newbury, England, the following alleged autograph: 'Thyne sweeteste. W. Shakspere Stratt Forde March 16'.) In fact, when we recall the forgeries, by William Henry Ireland, of entire plays like Henry the Second and Vortigern and Rowena,⁶ or G. A. Rhodes' Gunpowder Plot, or the fraud and forgery surrounding the strange fate of The Reuells Booke, 1605,⁷ not to speak of the ridiculous sight of old Boswell on his knees, reverently kissing Ireland's fabricated Shakespeareana and bursting out into a sort of *Nunc Dimittis*,⁸ we must be extremely careful not to be led astray by too much of that generous zeal which is prone to stamp each new discovery with the seal of authenticity.

A skilled philologist can tell the age of a manuscript as well as the age of a man. Accordingly, there has been no difficulty in docketing the authentic signatures of Shakespeare into the

¹ Harper's Monthly, vol. 120, 489 ff., "New Shakespeare Discoveries."

² According to Lee: Shre, but according to S. A. T.: Shr.

³ Personal observation of the writer, Spring, 1917.

⁴ See the Appendix to the present study.

⁵ Cf. Sir Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare. New edition, New York, 1916, pp. 516 ff. and Sir E. M. Thompson, in Shakespeare's England, I, 299–309.

⁶ Cf. "The Confessions" of William-Henry Ireland, London, 1805.

⁷ Cf. E. Law, Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries, London, 1911, and More About Sh. "Forgeries", 1913,—a vindication of the entries.

⁸ Cf. Scott and Davey, Historical Documents, London, 1891, p. 91, and J. A. Farrer, Literary Forgeries, London, 1907, p. 232.

date-class of the late sixteenth century. The English script of this time bears a close resemblance to the features of the modern German; that is, if we do not insist too stringently upon the separation of the latter's printed and cursive types, and of its majuscule and minuscule forms. It is the character which, since the decay, in the 12th century, of the fine Roman writing and the advent of capricious ornamentation in types, was current, in one form or other, among all the Teutonic nations, English, German, Dutch and Scandinavian.¹ In contrast to the round and graceful Roman type of the Renaissance, the Gothic is more angular, more slowly written and more disjointed. It has elongated and recurved top-strokes and a multiplicity of tails, points and acute angles.² A very characteristic difference from the Roman types consists in the prolongation of bases and summits into bent convex lines directed towards the body of the letter. If we now analyze either the specimens referred to, or the easily accessible, so-called, Shakespeare hand in a school-book now in the Library of Congress, Washington, *A Booke Containing Divers Sortes of Hands, etc.* Set forth by Iohn de Beau Chesne and M. Iohn Baildon. Imprinted at London by Thomas Vau-trouillier dwelling in the blackefrieres, M. D. LXXXI,³ we shall note such striking similarities as *r* with a double stem; *e* with a reverse loop; *d*, again, like the German; final *s*, like a German cursive final *s*, but with the upper arc reversed leftward; *y*, as well as *h*, each have a long outward tail, their descenders being at times of inordinate length; *h* is conjoined

¹ The letter addressed by the University of Louvain to its agent in Rome, 1601, found on p. 353 of Reusens, *Éléments de Paléographie*, Louvain, 1899, gives an example of the contemporary continental variety of the style. Georg Mentz, *Handschriften der Reformationszeit*, Bonn, 1912, illustrates the typically German forms of cursive Gothic. Thompson's *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford, 1912, contains excellent specimens of the kindred old English calligraphy; cf. no. 244.

² The Benedictines attributed its origin to a confused mixture of capital, uncial, minuscule and cursive letters, turned backward, as well as upside down. Cf. Silvestre, *Universal Palaeography*, trans., London, 1850, Vol. I, p. 648.

³ Another book in the same Library will be of interest, *The Writing Schoolmaster*. By John Davies of Hereford. Sold by Michaell Sparke at ye blue Bibell in Greeene Arbor, London, 1631.

particularly with a preceding *t* or *s* into a typical ligature; *c* is like the German cursive minuscule with the small upper curve; the long *s*, initial and medial, as well as the ligature *st*, are, again, analogous to the cursive German minuscule, *f* rather to the majuscule; *k* is very frequently a replica of the small printed, or even the written German type; *p* has a top in every respect similar to that of the cursive German *p* or *x*; minuscule *a* is preceded by the flourish found in the German capital *A*; capital *S*, as in Shakespeare's signatures, is exactly the German serpentine *S*. All these characteristics, and more, go towards the make-up of what is termed the "secretary" style,¹ which was much in vogue not only among professional scriveners and legal scribes but among other writers as well. It is the hand of Shakespeare's signatures.

In the usage of the educated classes this rugged and tortuous native English style was, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, practically supplanted by the cursive Italian handwriting,—the prototype of our modern Italics. The matter might perhaps be put more correctly by stating that the private correspondence of even the literati shows adherence to the old system. A letter of Francis Bacon in the Harleian Collection,² or, a finer specimen in Dr. Rainolds' letter to Dr. Thornton, dated 5 Feb 1591/2,³ is in the native English style. In a manuscript facsimile of Ben Jonson,⁴ that contemporary of Shakespeare is seen abandoning some of the features of the old in favor of the more pleasing traits of the new style. It is one of the clear, but by no means entirely novel, points of Thompson's investigation that Shakespeare's calligraphy is referred to this orthodox method taught in the free school of his native Stratford.⁵ While he is naturally not enabled to submit the proof direct, it may be accepted as

¹ Cf. Wright, Court Hand Restored, ed. Martin, 1879, p. xii.

² MS. 6997, f. 72, accessible in G. F. Warner's Universal Classic Manuscripts, Washington and London, 1901, where, curiously enough, a letter, in a similar style, by Sir Thomas More, 1534, may be found, Cotton MS. Cleopatra E. vi. f. 176.

³ Corpus Christi College, MS. 352, conveniently viewed on p. 232 of Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age, Oxford, 1914.

⁴ Royal MS. 18 A. xlvi. ff. 2b, 3, in Warner's Manuscripts.

⁵ Shakespeare's England, I, p. 297; Shakespeare's Handwriting, pp. 2 ff.

a fact that the poet was taught the strokes of the older style. Progress is always slower in the provinces; and, in fact, a letter of the year 1596 to Shakespeare from Richard Quiney of Stratford (father of the man who married the poet's daughter Judith) evidences all the traits of the Gothic style.¹ It is almost axiomatic that habits of writing, as well as those of speech, become so automatic and unconscious that it is usually impossible to change them radically. We are therefore more than inclined to lend credence to Thompson's theory that, altho he withdrew from the grammar school at the age of thirteen, Shakespeare would continue to employ the style which he had been taught in his youth. We even add that the case for the poet's authorship of the debated addition to Sir Thomas More is materially aided by the knowledge that transcriptions of theatrical productions, as shown by extant fragments of Greene's *Historie of Orlando Furioso*, c. 1591,² often were done in the same rough and angular style which appears in the More folios.

Shakespeare may have been a butcher's boy, a deer-poacher, horse-groom or a lawyer's copy clerk. Evidence there is none.³ Equally fanciful would seem the theory that Richard Field found work for his young countryman in Vautrouillier's printing office,⁴ or that, as John Aubrey reports it,⁵ he had even been a schoolmaster in the country. That, however, he

¹ No. 318, Stratford Museum; cf. *Shakespeare's England*, p. 294, as well as D. H. Lambert, *Cartae Shakespeareanae*, Sh. Documents, London, 1904, p. 28.

² *Malone Society Reprints*, 1907.

³ Various interpretations have been advanced of Thomas Nash's prefatory epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*, 1589. We content ourselves with quoting a part, "It is a common practice now a daies amongst a sort of shifting companions, that runne through every arte and thrive by none, to leave the trade of Noverint whereto they were borne, and busie themselves with the endevours of art, that could scarce lie latinize their neck verse if they should have neede." It may be that this refers to Shakespeare whom the vitriolic Greene excoriated three years later in his "Groat's worth of Wit". On the other hand, Thomas Kyd may be intended, whose father, we have reason to believe, was a sort of a lawyer's scrivener. Cf. *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, vol. xxxi, p. 349.

⁴ Blades, *Shakspere and Typography*, 1872.

⁵ A. Clark, *Aubrey's 'Life'*, 2 v. Oxford, 1898. Cf. also W. Wetz, *Die Lebensnachrichten über Shakespeare*, Heidelberg, 1912.

could write a fluent hand, is both attested by Heminges and Condell,¹ and evidenced in the 1612 signature discovered by Dr. Wallace which, altho the *W* seems somewhat constrained, is neither cramped because of limitations of space nor palsied by the breath of approaching death. It is, at the same time, an open question whether the scanty remains furnished by the six signatures, fourteen letters in all, inclusive of the phrase, 'By me', on the last leaf of the testament, can be utilized as material perfect and conclusive enough to secure more than a number of general inferences. Spedding, who was not acquainted with the free and bold autograph of 1612, is manifestly fantastic when he declares of the mooted hand in the Munday play,² "It is a hand which answers to all we know about Shakespeare's. It agrees with his signature; which is a simple one, written in the ordinary character of the time, and exactly such a one as would be expected from the writer of this scene, if his name was William Shakspere, and he wrote it in the same way." This statement, to which we shall return in a later section of this study, is open to two vital objections. First, it confuses the generic qualities of a period with the specific resemblances which alone can furnish proof for argument.³ Both the signatures of Shakespeare and the "additional three pages" indicated by Spedding show the characteristic features of the waning English script; but they offer no more evidence, in and for themselves, of representing the calligraphy of one and the same person than do the resemblances that necessarily exist—and can be pointed out—between two or more sets of manuscript specimens within any given epoch. We recommend the test with a well-known

¹ Cf. Reprint of the First Folio of 1623, London, 1876, "his mind and hand went together, and what he thought he uttered with that easiness that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers." This statement may perhaps refer only to some of the later works of the poet,—it is certain that the editors of the Folio made use in several instances of printed copies of the old Quarto editions,—but it cannot alter the significance of the implication.

² Notes and Queries, x, 228.

³ It is interesting to see that Sir E. M. Thompson whose book came into my hands after the preliminary historical investigation of the question was completed, brings the same charge against the naïveté of Richard Simpson. Cf. Shakespeare's Handwriting, p. 38.

modern type, such as the American Spencerian or, even more, with the American Vertical style, which is so prevalent in the handwriting of the present period.

Our second objection to Spedding's opinion, more apparent than real, has a significant bearing upon the scope, in the present instance, of Thompson's palaeographical comparisons. If the question of Shakespeare's participation in Sir Thomas More can be isolated to the three folio pages, 8^a, 8^b and 9^a, a view in which Thompson has followed the example of Spedding and Greg, p. ix, the problem becomes appreciably simplified, because such a procedure would set aside for observation the crucial literary passage, together with what would appear to be a typical calligraphy. Brooke and two contemporary palaeographists, Mr. Herbert of the British Museum and Sir George Warner, late Keeper of the Manuscripts at the same institution, have, however, arrived at a different conclusion. The last-named authority is inclined to believe that "the leaves containing the insurrection scene (the above three pages) are in a different hand from the rest, but he is not sure of the matter." This seems to be an interesting reversion to Simpson according to whom, in addition to these folios, 7^b, 12^{a & b}, 13^{a & b}, and 13^{* a} should also be assigned to Shakespeare. But as the second half of 13^b (Greg's E 212-242; Brooke's iii, 2, 283-322), as we have seen, is surely the handiwork of another writer, most likely Dekker, it is worthy of note that Herbert "considers all the scenes ascribed by Simpson to Shakespeare to be in one handwriting, with the exception of iii, 2, ll. 283—end." The quotation (as well as the one above) is derived from Brooke¹ who is in absolute harmony with the latter findings. While, now, a conscientious examination on the part of the present writer has disclosed some facts which make it impossible for him to agree with any view tending towards the identification of hands C and D, in their totality, it has also revealed such startling similarities between the two specimens that, granting a method and material may yet be found for the final adjudication of D to Shakespeare, he is unable to accept Thompson's findings without further ado. An analysis and criticism here of the

¹ Shakespeare Apocrypha, p. xl ix.

methods pursued by Thompson becomes thus of immediate necessity. This method consists in taking the six authenticated signatures of Shakespeare, analyzing the letters singly and in their ligatures,¹ and comparing the results thus obtained with the observations gained from a similar scrutiny of the three-page addition to Sir Thomas More. We must here remember that signatures Ia and Ib² are in reality the only ones available for a fully reliable comparison, because Ic, far from being free and untrammelled, is in a formal, 'printed' hand,³ and the second group, as a whole, is marked by bodily infirmity.⁴ The discovery, therefore, or the authentication of any more signatures might have an appreciable influence upon the testimony elicited from the present fund—and form—of the fourteen letters, a, e, h, i, k, l, m, p, r, s, y, B, S, W. It may even turn out in time that, with the authenticity of the Montaigne signature established, we shall possess in it a nearer criterion of Shakespeare's handwriting at the time of the composition of Sir Thomas More (about ten years, as we shall see, before the deposition signature of 1612) than in any other of the accepted autographs. But, as matters now stand, Thompson has concluded that, whilst the handwriting of Shakespeare was "of an ordinary type", and presented "few salient features for instantaneous recognition",⁵ there could still be distinguished such typically Shakespearian marks of identification as a certain carelessness of attitude; the delicate introductory upstrokes in IIc; the employment of the Italian

¹ Shakespeare's England, I, 299–309, and Shakespeare's Handwriting, pp. 1 ff. Cf. also Sir Sidney Lee, *A Life of William Shakespeare*, New York, 1916, pp. 518–523.

² Cf. p. 240 of the present investigation.

³ Not lack of space, as heretofore held, but the oily surface of the parchment is the cause of this careful cramping. (S. A. T.)

⁴ In connection with the second group, Sir E. M. Thompson acutely observes, p. 12, that the usual theory that the variation in the three signatures affixed to the will has to be explained on the ground that the poet wrote them at different times, cannot be tenable, because the legal procedure would require him to sign the documents at the time of the execution. This explanation accounts for the comparative fullness and elaborateness of the last signature by making it the first one penned, attached to the most important sheet, and emphasized by the words, *By me.*

⁵ Handwriting, p. 29.

long *s* in Ib and Ic; the unusual form of the *k* reminiscent of the German cursive letter, best observed in Ib and IIb; a spur on the open *u*-shaped *a*, as in Ia.¹ We are told that all these traits are to be observed in the folios 8^a, 8^b, and 9^a of the More additions, and that their cumulative evidence must inevitably point to Shakespeare's authorship of these pages.

There is a clear gain in the characterization given of these three folios. It has at all times been taken for granted that the pages represent the autograph composition of some author, and not a mere scrivener's transcript. Dr. Greg has, besides, pointed out, p. xiii, that he is a careless joint author who shows little respect for the play as a whole. Sir E. M. Thompson, p. 41, perceives in the first two pages evidences of haste, of rapid, speedy writing, whilst the last leaf is written with deliberation: the first pages picture the noisy tumult of the insurgents, the last page More's persuasive speech to the rioters. "If rare good fortune," he remarks elsewhere of the author, p. 55, "should ever lay before our eyes the autograph MSS. of Shakespeare's plays, we should expect to find, for example, the second style in Hamlet, the first in The Merry Wives of Windsor." The more deliberate style would then be the one which, because of temporary pauses and loss of momentum, would represent the personal peculiarities of the writer, among them the otiose upstrokes. The full value of this method is, however, impaired by the fact that folios 7^b, 11^{*b}, 12^{a&b}, 13^a, the upper part of 13^b, and 13^{*a}, which Thompson omits from his consideration, but the striking general similarity of which to the other three pages is beyond cavil and doubt (cf. above, Simpson, Brooke, Herbert and Warner), will be found to contain all but, perhaps, one of the specific resemblances upon which Shakespeare's authorship of the three folios has been built!

General traits of resemblance: *C*, the collective index of the second list of folio leaves, is, like *D*, the hand of the three folios, written in an old English handwriting, well-formed and, similarly, regular enough to evoke the suspicion of professional training. It can also be said to be of an ordinary type and presenting "few salient features for instantaneous

¹ Op. cit. pp. 19-29.

recognition." As studied on 7^b and 13^a, it has a strong pretence to beauty which is reminiscent of 9^a of hand *D*. It agrees, furthermore, with *D* in the almost typical total absence of punctuation marks. Delicate introductory upstrokes, in contrast to comparatively heavy downstrokes, declared by Thompson to be a peculiar feature, are not as uniformly abundant as they are on 9^a; but if due account is taken both of the manifestly more speedy nature of hand *C* and of the seemingly more absorbent nature of the paper it is found upon, then there still remains the fact that there are more and clearer upstrokes on 13^a—they are, of course, by no means lacking on the other leaves—than on either 8^a or 8^b.

Specific resemblances may next be noted between *C* and *D*, the scheme followed being that employed by Thompson, viz. the successive minuscule and majuscule letters of Shakespeare's signatures, so that the triangular similarities are evident at the first glance. The following list features, as far as possible, all those points in *C* in which an agreement exists between *D* and *S* (the signatures) :

a—the normal closed and the open, arched-link (*u*-shaped) forms are commonly employed. Examples of a ligature with a preceding *h*, for instance, fol. 7^b, l. 13, fol. 11^a*^b, l. 19, fol. 12^a, l. 14, in the words, 'sharpe', 'behaviour' and 'hairie'. The open *a* with a backspur, which is found frequently in *D*, is not a common trait of *C*. The latter might evidence instances, such as fol. 12^a, l. 21, 'share', l. 22, 'chaine',—7^b, l. 3, 'are', is the clearest,—but the condition of the leaf—the absorbent paper permits much of 12^b to be seen thru—and in general the closely written lines make such fine strokes difficult to discern. In the matter of a number of similar open *a*'s on 8^a, as in l. 4, 9, etc., definite identification is likewise impossible. We prefer, however, to rest the case with the finding that *C* totally *lacks* this form. We must add in the same breath that among the six authentic signatures of Shakespeare only a single one, Ia, contains the backspur *a*, that four of them, Ic and the whole group II, do not show even the ligature of the letter with the preceding *h*, and that, of course, the form in question can by no means be said to be the exclusive peculiarity of the poet. The so-called Baconian Promus MS. and Shakespeare's Will are full of it.

c—The reversed loop, as well as the form composed of two unlooped curves can be observed in *C*. Cf. fol. 12^b, l. 34, ‘Learned’ and l. 47, ‘vew’.

h—also creates a feature of resemblance, in that the *h* with the looped head and pendent bow occurs, linked or unlinked with the following letter. Examples are unnecessary, but it must be noted that the descenders in both *D* and *C* often are drawn into the next line.

k—The variety of forms found in Shakespeare’s signatures is common also to *C* as well as *D*. The following examples from *C* will suffice to show that we have here both the normal looped stem with a right angle or round base and the l-formations (seen in signatures Ib and IIb, as well as in 9^a, l. 39, 15 and 40, words ‘knyves’, ‘knees’, ‘lyke’), fol. 7^b, l. 4, ‘knock’, 11^{*b}, l. 18, ‘thinke’, l. 14, ‘physickt’, 13^a, l. 58, ‘musick’, 21^a, l. 15, ‘thinke’, l. 31, ‘cloakes’, etc.

m—nothing peculiar in the formation of this letter. An exchange of convexity and concavity in the minims is found in *C*, tho not to the extent of its occurrence in *D*.

p—fol. 7^b, l. 5, 14, fol. 12^a, l. 36, ‘prentises’, ‘prisoners’, ‘pted’, etc. will show letter with the medium stem as well as with the stroke meant to abbreviate *per* or *par*. There is no need to speak of the printed short-stem form in signature Ic.

r—this letter Thompson has omitted from his comparison of *D* and *S*, altho it is found in both. The reason seems to be that *r* occurs in the signatures only in the left-shouldered shape which is quite current to-day. But the important fact remains to be recorded that both *D* and *C* feature overwhelmingly the double-stemmed form reminiscent of the cursive German type.

s—To Thompson it seems to be a strong evidence for identity that a few instances of this letter appear in *S* and *D* not in the traditional English but in the Italian form: Ib, Ic, and IIc of the signatures as well as two corrections in *D*, 9^a, l. 7 and l. 18. The former case, the present writer holds, is doubtful: in l. 7 the stroke may have been intended as part of the word below the line (read, ‘only’); in 18, an objection is less evidently valid. Even so, if this letter is the sole one of the foreign type to be used in *S* and *D*, it is strange that it should also be found in *C*, in at least three places, fol. 7^b, l. 16, ‘S’,

13^a, l. 10 and 36, 'Erasmus'. But, in the 'Dekker' hand of 13^b it is of quite common occurrence.

B—The scrivener's elaborate type, found in signature IIc, is similarly common and similarly shaped in both additions; cf. for *C*, fol. 7^b, l. 7, 'Backt', 13^b, ll. 6 and 11, 'Barber'.

S—The serpentine Old English capital, which Shakespeare uses in his autographs, is the rule in *C*, even in the stage direction: 7^b, l. 1, 'Sr'.

W—There seems to be just one capital *W* in *C*, fol. 13^a, l. 28, 'When', but it is of the same type with the initial curve that is found in the signatures and in the only examples in *D*, fol. 8^a, ll. 35 and 37, 'Wisdom'.

This concludes the specific triangular comparison of the Signatures, the alleged Shakespeare addition to Munday's play, and a larger number of folio pages left unconsidered by Thompson. The results can be formulated to the effect that the formation of the letters in question,—all there are in *S*,—has been found to be similar in *D* and *C*. This includes the backspur *a*, the one foreign type of *s* and the double stemmed *r*, the latter of which is not to be found in the signatures. The chief result is, however, the conviction that the theory is not tenable according to which the presence of certain letter-forms in *S* and *D* must be taken to bespeak identity; for their absence is equally no evidence of dissimilarity. It must not be assumed that Shakespeare had a monopoly of letter forms or that he employed at all times the same calligraphic style, irrespective of his mood and writing materials.

Another set of observations has, moreover, been made, which discloses specific similarities between *D* and *C*, besides that of the double-stemmed *r*. In so far as they relate to single letters, such letters are not, of course, present in *S*; but where entire words are compared, the inference, to the incautious, would point to identity.

b—besides the form in which the stem is carried down to a round or pointed base whence the upward curve proceeds, there is a very peculiar shape with a basic spur like modern cursive German *B*. See fol. 7^b, l. 54, 'blowes', 9^a, l. 1, 'forbid', l. 19, 'rebell', etc. That it is made like our *h*, is shown by 9^a, l. 19, 'by'.

v, w—as in *D*, so in *C*, these two letters frequently have an initial flourish; cf. 8^a, l. 19, ‘vppon’, l. 37, ‘wisdome’ and 12^a, l. 22, ‘vsher’, l. 6, ‘prowd’.

y—the same form in both, with pendent bow in ligature with following letter, as in the case of *h*.

th—characteristic curve-top *t*, combined with the following *h* in a typical manner; cf. 7^b, l. 6, ‘them’ with 9^a, l. 1, ‘that’.

A—without a cross-bar. In *D* the curve has a dot in it, 8^a, l. 43, or not, 8^b, l. 14. In *C* the latter variety is found.

D—the enlarged minuscule in both parts.

E—crescent-shaped letter with central cross-bar, at times double, at other times like a loop.

L—sloping; both in *D* and in *C* the same upward and downward strokes, disposition and loop proportion. Numerous examples in text and margin. Fol. 8^b, l. 11, ‘Leade’, 8^a, l. 38, ‘L’, might even be cited to disprove Dr. Greg’s contention that 9^a, marginal ‘Linco’ is in *C*’s handwriting.

A few words taken almost at random from both divisions in order to show the similarity: 12^a, l. 6, ‘shouldst’ and 9^a, l. 29, ‘shoold’ (observe especially the ligature of *sh* and *ld*), 12^a, l. 24, ‘hart’ and 8^a, l. 9, ‘hart’, 8^b, l. 14, ‘good’ and 12^a, l. 29, ‘good’, 9^a, l. 9, ‘god’ and 12^a, l. 4, ‘god’, 8^b, l. 43, ‘before’ and 12^a, l. 28, ‘before’, 9^a, l. 3, ‘king’ and 12^a, l. 28, ‘king’. These pairs of words, when placed in juxtaposition, will show even more evidences of consanguinity than any given pair of Shakespeare’s signatures, save Ia-Ib and IIb-IIc.

One of the inferences drawn from the above remarks must be the inadequacy of the material furnished by the signatures of Shakespeare. It is sufficient and peculiar enough neither to prove the relationship between *S* and *D*, nor to disprove the possible relationship between *D* and *C*. The latter, in fact, have yielded significant resemblances. A superficial examination will tend to the opinion that there is more in common between any page of *C* and that part of *D* found on p. 9^a, than between the latter and the very formal and scribal upper quarters of 8^a and 8^b alike. The impression gained would thus seem to be that *C* and *D* were penned by one and the same person at different times. However, we are not dealing with the question of similarity but with that of identity. For this purpose, the various degrees and kinds of dissimilarity and diver-

gence are of more decisive importance than are resemblances. The danger inherent in Thompson's procedure, one that tends to vitiate his main contentions, is that of attributing to a fluent and intelligent writer but one rigid and invariable scheme of calligraphy. *Mutato nomine*, it is the argument in vogue against the Shakespearian signatures: this or that autograph cannot be authentic, because of its dissimilarity to the others! It need not be stressed that severe uniformity in informal documents and on all occasions is indicative rather of the calligraphic hesitation of the illiterate. "Es wird jeder," we read in a graphonomic investigation,¹ "der mit dem Gebiete der Handschriftenforschung vertraut ist, mir zustimmen, wenn ich sage, dass es gerade in einer genialen Handschrift unendlich schwer ist, zwei einander völlig gleiche Formen eines Buchstabens festzustellen, weil die Genialität der Handschrift gerade darauf beruht, immer neue Buchstabenformen, immer neue Kombinationen in den Verbindungen der Züge zu schaffen." When thus Madame Thumm-Kintzel, disregarding her own premise, proceeds to identify, on the basis of similarities, the hand of Shakespeare's signatures with the body of the Will and² with the hand of the Baconian Promus MS., she commits the precise error Sir E. M. Thompson would seem to be guilty of. As a matter of fact, an astonishing table of similarities can be drawn up from the Testament of Shakespeare and either hand *C* or hand *D*!

Among the variations to be found between the last two specimens may be mentioned the difference of ink, rich dark brown in the former and muddy yellow in the latter.³ This feature, however, is not vitally important, until connected with other evidence. Such evidence is furnished by the fact that in hand *C* the simple letter *p* is very frequently formed as if it were the ligature *p* representing *per* or *par*, whereas in the hand called *D* not only is such a hybrid formation absent but the ligature, wherever found, is employed with correctness. Similarly, the upper loop of the letter *f* in *C* has a marked ten-

¹ M. Thumm-Kintzel, 'Shakespeare-Bacon-Forschung,' *Der Menschenkenner*, I, 1909, p. 239.

² Cf. her article, 'Shakespeare-Bacon and the Promus-Manuscript'—accessible to me in a reprint kindly loaned by Dr. Tannenbaum.

³ Cf. Greg, pp. vii and ix.

dency to be in the shape of the numeral 3, as against the single arc found in *D*, or, more distinctive still, the form with the same numeral turned straight around its axis towards the right. Also, capital *I* or *J* in hand *D* is of the shape of modern German cursive minuscule *h*, whereas in *C* it is provided with a top arc and a medial stroke. Another letter formed in different manner is capital *C*, which is in general like an *O* with a medial cross stroke. In hand *C* it has an upper arc, in *D* it starts right at the cross-bar. But the most important feature,¹ exceeding in interest even the general editorship of the *D* folios by *C*, (*vide* also difference in ink), is the circumstance that, while both hands, in fact all those concerned in the play, separate their speeches by lines drawn across the page, those of *D* alone begin with a stroke resembling the number 2, and, in contrast with *C* (which has short and shading-off lines), go regularly beyond the length of the written line. All these traits make the identification of these two hands as one a matter of improbability, even tho, on the basis of Thompson's method, they could, as we have seen, be declared the work of a single individual. It is hoped that the unreliability of the deductions made on the evidence of fourteen letters alone needs no further proof.²

Shakespearian scholars have, indeed, condemned the weak and prosaic scenes contained in the folios written by *C*, as decidedly un-Shakespearian.³ There is thus no necessity to maintain, as Dr. Brooke has maintained, that Shakespeare's authorship of the Insurrection scenes may still be vindicated if we consider the commonplace scenes, v^a: More, Lord Mayor and Sir John Munday; viii: the Randall-Erasmus-More passages, containing the soliloquy of More and the comic Faulkner parts; viii^a: the 'T. Goodal' scene, as merely transcribed by the poet. Such a view would find support in the circumstance that *C* is seen copying upon fol. 13^a six lines written by *B* on fol. 16^b,—if, that is, *C* were identical with *D*, as Brooke holds. However, we are sure that the hand that wrote the inferior scenes was not the hand that wrote the Insurrection scenes. We are not sure, for we have not sufficient evidence,

¹ Pointed out to the writer by Dr. Tannenbaum.

² See also the review of T. A. Herbert, in *The Library*, Jan. 1917, p. 97. Brooke, op. cit. p. 1 (50) of the Introduction.

that the latter hand was that of Shakespeare. Whether the Insurrection scene, as a piece of literature, is the creation of Shakespeare's fancy, is for the next section to decide. For the present, we set down our finding that the palaeographical evidence for the Shakespearian origin of the More Addition is wanting and unsatisfactory.

III.

The literary aspect of the question, which, for obvious reasons is confined to the Insurrection scene, will be found to present an equally negative conclusion. Sir Thomas More itself lacks not only in dignity but in unity of intention and organization as well. It is a singular play, containing a comedy and a tragedy in one, scenes 1-10 and 11-17, which treats of the life and death of More. For the large part, it lacks significance, the sole passage that can lay claim to literary quality being the eirenic speech wherewith More quells the riot of the citizens of London against the proud Lombard merchants. Were it not for this fact and for the circumstance that, being a 'biographical history',¹ it brings out in effective relief at least the character of the protagonist, it would have to be classed with such senseless drivel as Fair Em and Mucedorus—both of which have been attributed to Shakespeare by Simpson and by Tieck. It certainly falls, in artistic conception and execution, far behind two other plays of the pseudo-Shakespearian cycle, Arden of Feversham and The Two Noble Kinsmen. Simpson's Shakespearian authorship of the comic parts as well as of the More speech in defense of order rests, in fact, on the very tenuous assumption that we find in them a Shakespearian quality of imagery and humor "quite unlike the poetry of Greene, Marlowe, Lodge or Robert Wilson." It is inconceivable that he chose to omit Ben Jonson as an alternative. Spedding² offers a more logical argument. The one scene in the play towers above the others. Nobody then living could have written it save Shakespeare. Tradition, moreover, represents him as a reviser or adapter of plays. He was, thus, called in to mend

¹ Not properly a chronicle play, as in Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play*, New York, 1902, pp. 214 ff.

² His article in the *Notes and Queries* is reprinted in *Reviews and Discussions, etc., not Relating to Bacon*, London, 1879.

the scene rejected by the censor. And, in fact,—one is tempted to interpret, "consequently"—the scene bears a resemblance to Shakespeare's youthful works! This, it will be recognized, is an insidious form of special pleading;¹ sheer circumstantial evidence which does not consider the improbability of the revision, as shown by internal earmarks.

Ward,² non-committal as to the handwriting, avers that More's speeches to the insurgents have the true Shakespearian manner and feeling, so that "it is with difficulty they can be conceived to have been written by any contemporary author." The first 172 lines of the insurrection scene appear to Brooke³ more thoroly in the tone of Shakespeare than any other passage in the doubtful plays. Moreover, "it is exactly the sort of scene we should expect Shakespeare to write, had he been called upon to revise the play, full of his well-known sentiments and expressed in a style which is very remarkably like his own during the period 1590-5."

The "authentic ring" of the brief passage,

'and leade the majestie of lawe in liom
to slipp him lyke a hound'

seems also to have captivated Percy Simpson.⁴ The sporting metaphor is not unworthy of Shakespeare. Hence he holds "He would not put forth his strength within the narrow limits of an improvised collaboration. Still less would he sew a patch of royal purple over a rent in the homespun of Anthony Munday."

The balance of critical opinion, however, is toward a decided incredulity. Furnivall⁵ finds "nothing necessarily Shakspearean in it, though part of it (is) worthy of him." Fleay,⁶ does not admit the collaboration of Shakespeare in the play.

¹ Sachs, Die Shakespeare zugeschriebenen zweifelhaften Stücke, in Jahrbuch der deutschen Sh. Gesellschaft, XXVII, 1892, p. 198, follows in the footsteps of Spedding.

² History of English Drama, II, 1899, pp. 214 ff.

³ Introduction, p. li.

⁴ Library, Jan. 1917, p. 93.

⁵ Introduction to the Royal Shakespeare, 1894, I, p. 115.

⁶ Life and Work, 1886, p. 292.

We have quoted Tennyson's views before, p. 237. W. W. Greg¹ cannot, despite the undoubted merit evidenced, regard the pages "with the admiration they have aroused in some critics." According to Creizenach² the insurrection "is described in a series of scenes where the unknown author approaches nearer than any one else has done to Shakespeare's masterly manner of handling large crowds on the stage," but Brooke, cf. above, is considered "somewhat bold in our opinion." The matter of Brooke's statement that the scene in question is full of the poet's well-known sentiments, must also be denied in view of the fact that More's speech to the rioters cannot be a sincere exposition of the divine right of kings—if, that is, we are really to think of Shakespeare—because in Richard II the poet treats the theory with mordant irony, and in addition, Henry V stamps him a scorner, at heart, of royal divinity.³ One is inclined to see in this ultra-loyal attitude rather the work of a Jacobean dramatist whose public utterance would but mirror forth the strictly enforced autocratic theory that to God the King is "a god on earth." The style itself is a matter of doubtful opinion which every reader has to solve for himself. Locrine, to cite but one of the list of Elizabethan dramas that have a mysteriously "communal" style, exhibits peculiarities that remind one of the recognized works of either Greene or Peele. Professor Brander Matthews seems to deliver the fitting pontifical sentence, when he says,⁴ "It might be possible to pick out a passage or two in which there may be something of Shakspeare's manner. But these passages are very few indeed, and they are discoverable only by the credulous."

It appears, indeed, to the present writer that were it not for the additional interest which the possibility of a Shakespearian holograph lends to the three folio leaves in question—and we have seen the utter inconclusiveness of this matter,—some critics would not so precipitately persuade themselves of the

¹ Op. cit., p. xiii.

² The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, transl. Philadelphia, 1916, p. 177 and fn.

³ Cf. Moorman, in Cambridge History of Eng. Literature, V, 1910, pp. 248 ff., and Sidney Lee, Shakespeare and the Modern Stage, New York, 1906, p. 156.

⁴ Shakespeare as a Playwright, New York, 1913, p. 366.

Shakespearian authorship of the insurrection scene. Despite wide divergences, there can be found thruout the Elizabethan drama, beside a typical woodenness and restraint, roguish and racy humor and a rare heroic passion,—a rain of spirit, distilled from the overladen literary atmosphere, that has, in a measure, permeated the lowliest as well as the foremost of the dramatists. We speak of polished intellectuality in the German classical period, of the sprightly intellectual brilliancy of French literature: youthful, animal exuberance characterizes the length and breadth of Shakespeare's era. It is supererogatory to maintain that "something Shakespearian" cannot be found in any contemporary production. Even his habit of using strange and recondite legal terms is paralleled in Spenser, Jonson, Massinger and Webster.

The fallacy also of considering the Insurrection scene a youthful work of Shakespeare becomes apparent when the actual date of the play is taken into account. Tilney's marginal directions and his resignation in 1608 in favor of his nephew, Buc (cf. Dict. Nat. Biog.), furnish a terminus ad quem. The references in the play, ll. 1006 and 1149, to Oagle a wig-maker mentioned in Cunningham's Revels Accounts for 1572 and 1584 do not afford a precise terminus a quo. The shop may have been in the possession of the man or of his family even at a much later date. Fleay, who assigned the drama either to Lodge or to Drayton, put its date at 1596, because of the uprising of 1595,¹ but later chanced the year 1594.² Simpson, regarding the riots of 1586 as the source of the Insurrection scene, decided for the year 1587.³ Brooke gave the matter a wide solution by compromising on 1587–1596. We know of no reason—if, that is, this kind of surmise is to be applied—why the bloody May day of 1517,⁴ on which the London populace rose against the foreigners, could not have been the source of the allusions, or, for that matter, why 1590–1596, proposed by Farmer,⁵ should not be the correct date. Dr. Greg, p. xix,

¹Life and Work of W. S., London, 1886, p. 292.

²History of London Stage, 1890, p. 154.

³Furnivall, Leopold Shakespeare, p. 102, "The allusions in the play fix its date as 1586, as Mr. Simpson acknowledged, when Shakespeare was probably at Stratford."

⁴Creizenach, op. cit. p. 177.

⁵The Tudor Facsimile Texts edition of Sir Thomas More, 1910.

seeing no necessity for connecting the Insurrection scene with any particular events,—and rightly so, since the meat of the play is the life of More!—decided first for 1592/3,—a date suitable for Thompson's purposes,¹—then again for the end of the century² which, he holds, would be fatal to the attribution of the addition to Shakespeare.³ Schücking's investigations, in fact, leave no doubt as to the impossibility of stamping the addition as a specimen of the poet's youthful work.⁴ For he demonstrates, by the similarity of parallel passages and phrases, that the mob-scene in the insurrection is an imitation of the mob-scene in *Julius Caesar*. A comparison with *Hamlet*, especially the circumstances surrounding the ‘play within the play’ (in our play an interlude is given at the banquet, *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*, an altered version of *Lusty Juventus*; More inquires of the players as to their origin and plans; engages them in his service; extemporizes in the place of a missing actor; the play is not terminated but is abruptly brought to a close, etc.), actual parallelisms, of plot and construction, also with *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry VI*, Fletcher's *Tamer Tamed*, moreover *Lord Cromwell* and Heywood's *Woman Killed With Kindness*,—all this shows that the play could not have been composed before 1604/5, the presupposition being that, as all modern critics admit, Dyce's dating of the additions to *Sir Thomas More* as of later origin, is to be disregarded. The end of the sixteenth century and the opening of the seventeenth have the identical script-custom, so that such a date would not be impossible from a palaeographical standpoint. The “secretary” is in vogue almost to a similar extent in the later as well as in the earlier period, even university graduates employing the English character in their ordinary correspondence. Shakespeare's autograph signatures, as we have seen, written all within the last four years of his life, between the 11th of May, 1612, and the 25th of March, 1616, are in the old style of handwriting.

¹ *Shakespeare's Handwriting*, p. 62.

² Creizenach also suggests 1600, *op. cit.* p. 234.

³ *Modern Language Review*, VIII, 1913, p. 89.

⁴ *Das Datum des pseudo-Shakespeareschen Sir Thomas Moore*, in *Eng. Stud.* XLVI, 1913, p. 228.

But, if the Addition is not in the style of Shakespeare's early period,—Professor Schelling being quite right that the hendecasyllabic character of the verses is very unlike the versification of his youth,¹ the evidence of 'metrical tests', as far as they can be considered reliable from the paucity of the material, will but confirm in a general way the testimony of the external history which we have just recorded. It is understood, of course, that some of the tests must be regarded with distrust, because of the mixture of maturity and immaturity often found in the same play of Shakespeare and because of the anticipation of and reversion to features in many cases.² In the Addition we have, according to the manuscript and the diplomatic reprint of Greg, 147 lines. The Addition, moreover, comprises at most only 84 lines of verse, and some of these are so run together as to amount to prose and be of no avail for the test of feminine endings. The results obtained under such circumstances consist of 10 per cent enjambment, 3.5 per cent rhyme, 24 per cent feminine endings, and pause preponderantly at the end and after the second foot. There is not sufficient material for the speech-ending test.

The year 1604 being the year of the composition of Othello, the most perfect of Shakespeare's tragedies, wherein form, language, thought and passion blend more harmoniously than in any other play of the dramatist, we would have to postulate that at this late stage of development, independence and reputation,—seven of the eleven plays chosen for the winter season of this year before the royal court were from Shakespeare's pen³—, he was guilty of self-plagiarism from his Julius Caesar (to restrict ourselves merely to More's speech and the riotous mob),—the converse, that in Julius Caesar he repeated himself from a 'youthful' work of a decade or so ago, being equally fantastic—and perhaps even performed a scrivener's task of copying a scene, in behalf of such an admittedly inferior and insipid play as Sir Thomas More! And from the

¹ Chronicle Play, p. 215.

² Cf. Sir Sidney Lee, *William Shakespeare*, new ed. New York, 1916, p. 101; Furnivall, Introduction to the Leopold Shakspere; and Morton Luce, *Handbook to the Works of W. S.*, London, 1906, p. 452, giving the work of Ingram, Fleay and Bradley.

³ Cf. Lee, new ed., p. 383.

travail of the mountains produced all but a ridiculous rodent that will scarcely bear frequent inspection! Is it not more sensible to assume from the 'deadly parallelism' of the other plays as well that, considering the prevalence of literary piracy against which the law afforded no protection,¹ when a Lyly could without acknowledgment embody in his Euphues a translation of a Plutarchian letter, and when Greene flung about wholesale charges of beautification with alien feathers, the joint authors of Sir Thomas More laid Shakespeare, Fletcher, Heywood and others equally under a summary contribution? A Shakespeare *influence*, thus, is more in place here than a Shakespearian *authorship*. The metrical tests themselves could assign the Addition to a period far before Shakespeare's Othello, for the most reliable test, that of run-on lines, puts it abreast of Henry VI or of The Taming of the Shrew. The former, we would say, would be rather a terminus a quo, for the real author, from all impressions, must have been a man of dramatic talent who was either responsible for the Jack Cade scenes as well, 2 Henry VI, iv, 2, or at least made use of them for his mob in the Addition. But of this presently.

No account of the present problem would be complete without a reference, at least, to the psychology of the mob, as a whole, and to the obviously superior phrases scintillating thru the pacific speech of Sir Thomas. Expressions like 'hath Chidd downe all the ma<jes>tie of Ingland', 'and you in ruff of your opynions clothd', 'and leade the ma<jes>tie of lawe in liom', 'and this your mountanish inhumanity', have the true Shakespearian ring and appearance. They are, however, by no means unique in this respect, isolated as they occur in the appeal of More. A number of similarly striking phrases and clauses can be culled from other contemporaneous works. For instance, 'Let him without controulment have his will', 'That like a mountaine overwhelmes my blisse', 'Can you in words make show of amitie, And in your shields display your rancorous minds?'—from Marlowe's Edward II, could without serious objection be classed as Shakespearian in sense and sound. Some future evidence may, indeed, be brought for-

¹ Cf. Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession of the Elizabethan Age*, Manchester, 1909, p. 135.

ward which may establish definitely the authorship of the mooted pages; in the meantime, however, it is our duty to point out that there exists in the period under discussion not only, what may be called, an orotund utterance of thought but also a common literary possession of striking phrases. A figure, like 'sparks rakt up in embers', is to be found thruout the Elizabethan drama, and the turn, 'she bears a duke's revenue on her back', appears not only in Shakespeare but in Marlowe as well, in Euphues, in *The Servingman's Comfort* and, in fact, in the range of satire in general.

Nor is the mob, with its logic, philosophy and phraseology, by any means exclusively Shakespearian in tone and behaviour. It is typically like the mob of Shakespeare. But, any one who has studied the 'many-headed multitude'¹ in the wake of MacCallum, Oehme and Tupper,² has realized that the irrational, impressionable and vacillating crowd, bent on riot under a various-minded leadership, to be pacified in the end by a More or a Clifford, or, indeed, lashed up to fury by an artful Antony, is not the distinctive invention of Shakespeare's fancy, but the expression of a well-established stage convention, composed of easily discernible traditional elements. The insurrection scene in *Sir Thomas More* is but one instance of the application of a common theatrical pattern which may be studied elsewhere in *Jack Straw*, Greene (*George-a-Greene*), Lodge (*Wounds of a Civil War*), Heywood (*the Falconbridge rebellion in Edward IV*), Webster (*Appius and Virginia*), and other predecessors and contemporaries of Shakespeare.

IV.

We would then summarize from the foregoing discussion that nothing memorable or momentous in the nature of palaeographical or literary evidence has as yet been advanced which would establish the existence of a holograph composition of

¹ Horace's *belua multorum capitum*, a phrase found, in one form or other, in Webster, Fletcher, Chapman, Massinger, and others, as well as in Shakespeare.

² Respectively, *Shakspere's Roman Plays and their Background*, London, 1910,—*Die Volksszenen bei Shakespeare und seinen Vorgängern*, Berlin, 1908,—'The Shaksperean Mob', in *P. M. L. A.*, XXVII (1912), 486 ff.

Shakespeare with more than the generous zeal born of a reverent desire to behold the master poet in his work-shop. It is, at the same time, worth our notice that Spedding's remark to the effect that the handwriting of the insurrection scene in Sir Thomas More is "exactly such a one as would be expected from the writer of this scene",¹ whilst a mere obiter dictum, seems to foreshadow all the involved paraphernalia of literary identification which have come to be associated with the name of Eduard Sievers,—and seems to fall by the verdict of this apparatus as well.

The method of muscular reaction, as is well known, is but a practical application of the principle discovered by the Bavarian singer, J. Rutz, to the effect that every piece of music or literature postulates a definite tonal rendition, without which the performance is uneven, laborious, injurious to the vocal chords, and absolutely devoid of subjective satisfaction. It has for one of its aims the acquisition of the correct anatomical pose for the production of sound, spoken or sung.² It would lead us too far to rehearse the details of the theory which has definitely established three major types of speech-melody, the Italian, French and German,³ and various permutations of each with such subordinate types as cold, warm, lyric, dramatic, etc. corresponding to a change in mood and subject-matter. What is of importance to remember is that each of these types and subtypes has been found to depend for its successful performance upon a definite set of movements in the skeletal muscles, and that thru the deliberate execution of these strain combinations, fixated by introspective analysis, any one of the varied types of 'feelings' can be brought about at will.

When we remember that Flaubert used to spend hours over a sentence, testing it by declamation, humming and beating

¹ Loc. cit. p. 228.

² Consult, besides Sievers' *Rhythmisich-melodische Studien*, Heidelberg, 1912, O. Rutz, *Neue Entdeckungen von der menschlichen Stimme*, München, 1908; id., *Sprache, Gesang und Körperhaltung*, 1911; *Neues über den Zusammenhang zwischen Dichtung und Stimmqualität*, in Idg. Forsch., XXVIII, 301; *Musik, Wort und Körper als Gemütsausdruck*, Leipzig, 1911; *Ueber Sprachmelodisches in der deut. Dichtung*, in *Annalen der Naturphilos.* I, 76; also, F. Krueger, *Mitbewegungen beim Sprechen, Singen und Hören*, Leipzig, 1910, and Luick, *Ueber Sprachmelodisches in deut. und eng. Dichtung*, in *GRM*, 1910, p. 14.

³ Named so, because the type predominates among those nations.

time to it; when we recall his statement, born of experience that "a well-constructed phrase adapts itself to the rhythm of respiration", or Rémy de Gourmont's that style is first of all physiological, we can better understand the nature of the discovery that not only does the rhythm or melody of any individual piece of human production create in us a definite kinaesthetic association,—something well-known to psychology,¹—but also the production as a whole, as a compound of all such stimuli. We speak of the character of a handwriting, as well as of the peculiar charm of a Gothic cathedral. Why does a strain of music remind us of the romantic melody of Chopin, a suffused scenic atmosphere look, for all the world, like the work of Corot? We react in a varied manner and quality to a Grecian vase and to a piece of modern pottery. An ancient coin not only has a sentimental value, but demands and registers a definite physical attitude as well. The paintings of the Italian Renaissance have a certain color-scheme, proportion and delineation, a certain warmth of tone that is so 'typical' as to become infectious, and imitable by a painter in possession of the requisite technique and sensitiveness. Indefinite statements, such as Buffon's "le style est l'homme même", or Samuel Butler's "Every man's work, whether it be literature or music or pictures or architecture or anything else, is always a portrait of himself",² can thus be put on a definite basis of notation, every man to his type. What a corrective or promotive part Sievers' schematic wire-imitations of the typical muscular responses³ can eventually come to play in the methodical exploitation of this knowledge, is for the future to decide. The outstanding facts of the situation, plausible enough to merit attention, record the applicability of muscular observations not only to literature, but also to painting, statuary and to the traits of handwriting as well.⁴ Schammbberger has obtained

¹ Cf. The Rôle of Kinaesthesia in the Perception of Rhythm, Amer. J. of Psych. XXIV, 305-359.

² The Way of All Flesh.

³ Described in Katzenstein's Archiv. f. exper. u. klin. Phonetik, I, 1914, 225-252. According to Saran, Das Hildebrandslied, Halle, 1915, p. 17, "So vermag der geübte Experimentator, fast wie der Augenarzt die richtige Brille, die für die Betrachtung eines Schriftbildes geeigneten Drähte und damit den Typus zu ermitteln."

⁴ Rutz, Musik, Wort, Körper, pp. 96 and 442.

identical reactions from the contemplation of Böcklin's paintings and of his calligraphy. Letters of one and the same person in several languages, such as the French and German letters of Frederick the Great, evidence the same type, whereas in the translation of a work the quality of the translator comes to the fore. A conscious imitation, like the late James Whitcomb Riley's Leonainie, in the orthodox manner of Poe, could not, of course, be adduced as evidence of Riley's 'typical' technic.

If, thus, a definite system of individual 'types', based on a common psychic principle, exists in correlation with the perception of every individual production, it follows that the consciously sympathetic observation of Shakespeare's literary output, of the creative presence of his ego, as embodied either in the spoken recital of his work, or in the autograph composition of the poet, should be conducive to the identical 'typical' experience,—the very axiom which Spedding's untutored instinct expressed in a simpler but none the less clear language.

It has been thought necessary to give the above discussion of the principles and examples of this new criterion, because its more general acceptance is impeded, and its modicum of important truth obscured, for lack of a clear formulation as well as because of the enthusiastic exaggeration of its uses and purposes. With this done, it remains to be recorded that whilst the physical and psychological reaction of Goethe's works pertains to the first, i. e. Italian type,—dark and soft quality of voice, combined with an abdominal strain which consists in the horizontal arching of the abdomen,—Shakespeare has been found¹ to belong to the second, i. e. French type, wherein the voice is clear and soft, and the strain is thoracic, with the upper part of the body arched forward in a military position. Goethe cannot be read without an effect of discomfort and parody in the normal, erect manner of Shakespeare, nor vice versa. Within these limits the subtype varies according to the dramatic, lyric, cold and warm feeling of the particular piece. The psychological experience of the present writer—who has offered this test *merely as registering his personal observation*,—places the debated addition to Sir Thomas More in the first class, that is, as to the contents, tested by unforced recitation on the part of him-

¹ Cf. Indogermanische Forschungen, XXVIII, 323.

self and of other experimenters. There seems to be, intrinsically, little in it of the Shakespearian persuasiveness in Mark Antony's harangue, or of any further quality found in such personal utterances as the Epilogue to *The Tempest* or the Sonnets, in the main. Curiously enough, it is particularly More's 'Antony-like' harangue on fol. 9^a that refuses to register the Shakespearian reaction!

In fine, the tests of palaeography, chronology, 'metrics' and of vital individuality have alike brought us to the conclusion that there are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of the theory that in the More addition we have, to use a phrase of Heminges and Condell, a collaboration of Shakespeare's hand and heart. Nor shall we be far from the scrupulous honesty of these editors of the First Folio, if, unwilling to disown Shakespeare too readily because of an occasional Homeric nod, we proceed slowly in concentrating upon him all the generic qualities of his period, and hesitate to identify, and laud him, in passages of doubtful provenience. There is too much similarity between the present problem and the development of the Baconian theory to justify the hope that Shakespeare's more intimate connection with the play of Sir Thomas More will at all become finally discredited. But, if the initial doubts of Consul Hart¹ as to the authorship of Shakespeare have gathered momentum and begot not only the numerical and bi-literal cryptograms from Bacon's pen but also the shifting of the responsibility, successively, to Robert Burton, the Earl of Rutland, and Sir Walter Ralegh as well,² it is at least to be wished that the entire play of Sir Thomas More might not one day be assigned to the much-maligned William Shakespeare.

ALEXANDER GREEN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, April 7TH, 1917.

¹ *Romance of Yachting*, 1848.

² Cf. 'Who wrote Shakespeare?' by Multum in Parvo, in *Denver Tribune-Republican*, 1885; Demblon, *Lord Rutland est Shakespeare*, Paris, 1913; and Pemberton, *Shakspere and Sir Walter Ralegh*, Philadelphia, 1914.

Appendix. In the quarterly review, *The Library*, for July, 1917, under the title of *Two Pretended Autographs of Shakespeare*, Sir E. M. Thompson recapitulates the microscopic analysis of his Shakespeare's

Handwriting, in an effort to prove the spuriousness of the signatures in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Montaigne's *Essays*. There can be but complete agreement as to the former being a clumsy forgery of the last signature on the Will of Shakespeare. With respect to the latter, however, Thompson has both underestimated the inadequacy of his comparisons and exaggerated such features as "the irregularity in the scale of the writing", "the disjointed method of inscribing the letters", "the ignorantly conceived s", "the impossible p", etc. It is feared that altogether too much has been made of setting up as a model the signatures of the Will, affording as they do evidence of physical disability, and of referring to them certain characters or formations of the Montaigne signature, as exhibiting peculiarities "due to failing strength", hence cleverly fabricated by a forger familiar with the style and practise of the former group of signatures! The argument that Shakespeare would not anticipate his death-bed handwriting when inscribing his name in his books, by no means precludes the possibility that his death-bed signature, save for the characteristic tremor, would not be radically dissimilar from that of his normal and healthy days.—A. G.

II.—THE FUNCTION AND THE DRAMATIC VALUE OF THE RECOGNITION SCENE IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

There are three fundamental emotions in dramatic art upon which the value of the separate scenes and the value of the play as a whole depend. These emotions are sympathy, suspense and surprise. No one who studies the technique of Greek tragedy can fail to be impressed by the remarkable skill with which the dramatists arouse these emotions. On the other hand, no one who studies Aristotle's treatise on dramatic technique can fail to be surprised that this master technician *apparently* does not discuss these three fundamental emotions of the theatre. Only sporadically, among the countless commentators on the Poetics, does one find a mention of these very foundations of dramatic art. We shall try to show, however, that Aristotle did know the value of sympathy, suspense and surprise; and that the value of the recognition scene is to be judged, and was judged by him, in relation to these emotions.

I.

The words *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* as employed by Aristotle in the Poetics, have been variously translated and variously explained.¹ In English, they have finally come to be universally translated "pity and fear". Aristotle employs these words *ἔλεος* and *φόβος*, not only in discussing the function of tragedy, but also in dealing with the technique of tragedy. If we leave aside for the time being the question of the function of

¹ Euanthius held that in tragedy there must be magni timores (IV, 2). The words *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* are translated respectively as follows. We find in Latin versions of the Poetics: misericordiam, miserationem, metum; in Spanish: lástima, misericordia, miedo, terror; in Italian: misericordia, commiserazione, compassione, pietà, orrore, spavento, terrore, timore; in French: pitié, compassion, peur, crainte, terreur, horreur; in German: Mitleid, Schrecken, while Lessing points out that not Schrecken, which is a sudden fear, but Furcht is the correct word; in English: pity, compassion, fear, horror, terror.

tragedy, to tell a modern dramatist that the aim of certain scenes, such as an anagnorisis combined with a peripeteia, is to arouse pity and fear,¹ is tantamount to telling him that the aim of these scenes is to arouse certain emotions which, as a dramatist, he studiously avoids calling forth. We cannot dismiss this attitude of mind with mere disdain. We must ask whether Aristotle or the modern dramatist is correct; or whether the modern man in an audience differs from the ancient Athenian. Even though we etherialize the words *ἔλεος* and *φόβος*, and divest them of their painful and morbid element, we must still ask whether, as far as dramatic art is concerned, the words "pity and fear" always express the exact shade of meaning whenever *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* are employed by Aristotle.

Aristotle's definition of tragedy is, at the same time, a description of the function of tragedy and a justification of its right to exist. Plato would banish tragedians from his ideal republic because they caused people to give way to dangerous emotions, one of which is pity. "For", he says, "the reflection is not often made that from the evil of others the fruit of evil is reaped by ourselves, or that the feeling of pity which has been nursed, and has acquired strength at the sight of the misfortunes of others, will come out in our own misfortunes and cannot easily be controlled".² Plutarch says that, according to Aristotle, certain women were childless because of their passions of fear and grief.³ Whether this be Aristotle or merely Aristotelian tradition, we have excellent evidence that pity and fear were regarded as dangerous emotions. Whereas Plato would forbid the production of tragedy because it arouses emotions, Aristotle wished to justify the existence of tragedy by insisting that the function of tragedy is to arouse and to purge the mind of *ἔλεος* and *φόβος*. It is not difficult to believe that these words would have been almost forced upon Aristotle by contemporary discussions of drama, even if he had preferred not to employ them in his discussion of tragedy. When Aristotle has justified the existence of tragedy on the ground that it purges the mind of

¹ 1452 a 38.

² Plato, *Republic*, X, 606, Jowett's translation.

³ Plutarch, III, 178.

ἔλεος and *φόβος*, then, as a logician, he was practically forced to employ these words in dealing with the technique of tragedy in order not to shift his ground and in order to prove his case. Thus confusion arises, for while the dramatist can understand the argument of Aristotle concerning the function of tragedy, if he keeps in mind Plato's attack on tragedy, the dramatist feels that when Aristotle is discussing the technical value of certain scenes, as arousing pity and fear, he really means emotions akin to those expressed by these words, namely, sympathy and suspense.

Aristotle defines *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* in the Poetics as follows: "Nor on the other hand should an extremely bad man be seen falling from happiness into misery. Such a story may arouse the human feeling in us (*φιλάνθρωπον*) ; but it will not move us either to pity or fear (*οὐτὲ ἔλεον οὐτὲ φόβον*) ; pity is occasioned by undeserved misfortune, and fear by that of one like ourselves."¹ In a note on 1456 a 21, Bywater says: "Aristotle's theory is that the tragic situation should be *ἔλευσόν*—which implies that the sufferer does not deserve his misfortunes; . . . he incidentally admits, however, that it may be only *φιλάνθρωπον*, . . . as it is, for instance, when the sufferings of the wicked are put before us in such a way as to arouse a certain commiseration or human feeling for the sufferers. The later Tragedy would seem to have affected this inferior tragic motive." We do not agree with Bywater when he says in a note to 1452 b 38 that this feeling of commiseration even for the wicked in misfortune is not, however, "pity proper, since it lacks the moral basis of all pity, the belief that the misfortune is not deserved." We must insist that in the language of the modern dramatist the sufferings of the wicked hero, such as Richard III or Hedda Gabler, arouse pity, through human feeling, and not sympathy, through fellow feeling. In the second place, undeserved misfortune "brought upon the hero not by vice and depravity but by some error of judgment" arouses sympathy. Indeed, Aristotle's ideal tragic hero and the heroes of most of the extant Greek tragedies are what dramatists call "sympathetic characters". Aristotle further defines *ἔλεος* in the Rhetoric as "a sort of pain at an evident evil of a destructive or painful kind in the case of

¹ 1453 a 1. The Poetics is cited in Bywater's translation.

somebody who does not deserve it, the evil being one which we might expect to happen to *ourselves* or some of our friends and this at a time when it is near at hand.”¹ This definition, and especially the idea that the evil might happen to ourselves, leads us to believe that, in the language of the modern dramatic critic, *ἔλεος* means “sympathy” and not “pity”, because, as Crabbe says, “pity, though a tender sentiment, is so closely allied to contempt that an ingenious mind is always loath to be the object of it.”² “It galls us to be pitied”, says the Century Dictionary. “Sympathy (feeling or suffering with)”, says the Standard Dictionary, “implies some degree of equality, kindred or union; pity is for what is weak or unfortunate, and in so far at least inferior to ourselves; hence pity is often resented where sympathy would be welcome”. It seems pretty plain from these definitions, and especially from the ideas of union, kindred and fellow-feeling for people like ourselves contained in both the Greek and English, that *ἔλεος* means “sympathy” and not “pity”. In Sophocles’ Electra, Chrysothemis arouses pity, but Electra arouses sympathy, and it is needless to say that the sympathetic character is the heroine. There is certainly nothing sacrosanct in the traditional translation of *ἔλεος* as “pity”; and, however the word may be translated, unless the modern dramatic critic knows that Aristotle employs the word in certain cases where the critic would use “sympathy”, not “pity”, the Poetics is going to remain unintelligible to him in these passages.

As for the word *φόβος*, which, as Bywater points out in a note on 1452 b 32, means the “expectation of coming evil”, we must insist that in the language of dramatic critics “the expectation of coming evil” is “suspense”. Although it may be objected that “suspense” is a weaker word than “fear”, yet it is fear which causes suspense. Bywater adds: “The distinction between the *φοβητά* and *ἔλεινά* in a play may be seen in the Oedipus Tyrannus, in which we are gradually prepared for the piteous incidents of the catastrophe by a series of premonitions of coming evil in the earlier scenes.” It would be difficult to give a better explanation of the manner in which a playwright arouses suspense.

¹ II 8, 1385 b 13, Welldon’s translation.

² Crabbe, English Synonyms.

Having gone thus far, we freely admit that the words "sympathy and suspense" will not apply entirely in Aristotle's definition of the deed of horror (1453 b). Here it is not a question of suspense; but surely it is not begging the question to say that, in this passage, Aristotle is discussing how to increase the horror, not the fear, in the situation. The fact that Oedipus is the son of Jocasta, or that Orestes is the brother of Iphigenia, increases the horror of the situation, but it does not increase our dramatic suspense, our fear that the situation may have a tragic outcome. Certainly no one will argue that *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* refer to emotions in the heart of the spectator, who, beholding Oedipus, selfishly pities himself, and fears that a similar misfortune may befall himself. Surely such a painful and inartistic function of tragedy did not enter Aristotle's mind.

II.

In order to clear the field fully for a discussion of the function and the dramatic value of anagnorisis, we must investigate the third important element in dramatic technique, namely, surprise, for we cannot separate surprise from suspense in any discussion of the technique of the drama.

Perhaps the most vital law which Aristotle laid down in regard to the technique of tragedy is the law of the probable or necessary sequence of events. As he says: "There is a great difference between a thing happening *propter hoc* and *post hoc*."¹ Furthermore he makes the following significant statement: "Tragedy, however, is an imitation not only of a complete action but also of incidents arousing pity and fear (sympathy and suspense). Such incidents have the very greatest effect on the mind when they occur unexpectedly and at the same time in consequence of one another."² Bywater comments on this passage as follows: "At this point Aristotle recognizes a new element of interest in tragedy, the element of surprise, but only incidentally in order to bring it under the canon of construction laid down in chap. 7. The φοβητὰ καὶ ἔλεινά of Tragedy, he says, have the very greatest effect on the mind when they come in unexpectedly, but at the same time as the natural or necessary consequence of the incidents

¹ 1452 a 20.

1452 a 1.

within the play itself." Twining comments: "The effect of surprise when combined with Pity or Terror, is to add force to those latter passions which necessarily predominate in the combination and to raise the whole to a higher pitch." We may add that the element of surprise increases laughter, for humor depends upon the incongruous and the unexpected. Surprise produces a mental shock. Thus a scene of suspense, either tragic or comic, ending with a surprising turn of an unexpected development is of greater dramatic value than a scene of suspense which turns out about as one anticipates. The great power of the Oedipus Rex as a play on the stage depends, to a large extent, on the fact that almost everything turns out contrary to both our hope and expectations; and yet, at the same time, analysis shows that the causal sequence of events is inevitable. The handling in this manner of scenes of suspense ending with a surprise, but still in necessary sequence, makes this play perhaps the most perfect piece of dramatic technique in existence.

Aristotle also brings the element of surprise into his discussion of the deed of horror.¹ After mentioning two situations in which there is no possible surprise, he says: "A better situation than that, however, is for the deed to be done in ignorance, and the relationship to be discovered afterwards, since there is nothing odious in it and the Discovery will serve to astound us." Also the situation which he considers the best one contains the same element of surprise, the only difference between the two scenes being that in the latter the recognition occurs before the accomplishment of the deed. Bywater comments in part: "The Discovery is said both here and in 16, 1455 a 17 to be 'astounding', just in the same way as a *περιπέτεια*—which in a play is so intimately connected with the Discovery—is said in Rhet. I. II, 1371 b 10 to be *θαυμαστόν*." This note leads us to 1455 a 17 which reads: "The best of all Discoveries, however, is that arising from the incidents themselves, when the great surprise comes about through a probable incident." Also, as the note suggests, peripeteia is intimately connected with anagnorisis and is said to be *θαυμαστόν*.

Now as Greek tragedies are constructed, the peripeteia certainly contains the element of surprise. The fact that the

¹ 1454 a ff.

Oedipus Rex was undeniably a play which appealed very strongly to Aristotle is extremely significant. During the anagnorisis he must have been in great dramatic suspense and this suspense was only ended by the peripeteia—in this case a *coup de théâtre* ushered in with a dramatic shock of surprise. This is a situation desired by every dramatist, namely, to arouse suspense and then to have the unexpected happen through a complete reversal. This explains why Aristotle insisted upon the value of this scene in the Oedipus Rex. The anagnorisis was not dramatic because it was a recognition scene, but because it aroused suspense. The peripeteia was dramatic because it ended that suspense with a wholly surprising turn of events.

Thus it seems that Aristotle felt the value of the three great dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. Now let us see what is the function and the dramatic value of anagnorisis, basing our discussion upon the relation of the recognition scenes to these emotions, which are the very soul of all drama. Thus, and only thus, can we judge the merit of anagnorisis in Greek tragedy, or, indeed, in any form of drama.

III.

Aristotle divides anagnorisis into three general classes.¹ 1. Anagnorisis which may occur "in reference to inanimate things". Although he does not give an example of this form, it may be pointed out that the recognition by Neoptolemus of the belongings of Philoctetes falls into this class. 2. Anagnorisis as to whether some one has or has not done something. Again we may supply as an example the anagnorisis on the part of Theseus that Phaedra has committed suicide. 3. The anagnorisis of persons, which, he says, is most directly connected with the plot. This is a statement which must be questioned, since the mutual recognition of Orestes and Iphigenia is no more directly connected with the plot than is the discovery by Theseus that Phaedra has taken her own life.

The anagnorisis of persons is divided by Aristotle into five classes in order of ascending merit.

¹ 1452 a 34.

1. Anagnorisis by tokens or marks:

a. Tokens or marks disclosed by chance. (*Odysseus by Eurycleia.*)

b. Tokens or marks disclosed purposely. (*Odysseus by the swineherd.*)

2. Anagnorisis by self-disclosure. (*Orestes reveals himself to Iphigenia.*)

3. Anagnorisis through memory from a man's consciousness being awakened by something seen or heard. (*Tale of Alcinoüs.*)

4. Anagnorisis through reasoning:

a. Good reasoning. (*Orestes by Electra in the Chœphoroe.*)

b. Bad reasoning. (*Odysseus, the False Messenger.*)

5. Anagnorisis arising from the incidents themselves when the great surprise comes about through a probable incident, like that in the *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, and also in the *Iphigenia*.

Professor Perrin, in an article entitled *Recognition Scenes in Greek literature*¹ has attacked the problem of the relative merit of the recognition scenes from the point of view set forth by Aristotle in his classification. Professor Perrin reaches the following conclusion: "We have seen, then, that of Aristotle's five classes of recognitions, three—the second, third, and fourth—must fall away as non-exclusive; and that the principle of directness or indirectness in conveying proofs of personal identity, admitted to be important by Aristotle, must be made supreme as a principle of classification. Recognitions of the highest art are the result of proof of identity conveyed indirectly, preferably without the use of signs and tokens, although by no means necessarily so."²

Professor Perrin classifies recognitions as follows:

I. Spontaneous, without "delay", without proof.

II. Induced by proof.

A. Direct and formal by means of signs.

B. Indirect, informal and artistic.

a. By means of signs.

b. Without the use of signs.

¹ *American Journal of Philology*, XXV (1909), 371 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 403-4.

Interesting as his discussion is Professor Perrin has not investigated the one vital problem for the dramatist, namely, the function and the dramatic value of the recognition scene. The *Poetics* is, in part, a treatise on playwrighting; and to analyse these scenes as separate entities, not as parts of the whole framework of the play, is to discuss only a part of the problem. Professor Perrin designates the indirect, informal recognition as "artistic". Would he be willing to substitute the word "dramatic"? If so, what makes these scenes dramatic? What emotions do they arouse, and how do they arouse these emotions? These are the questions which interest the dramatist; and these are the questions we shall attempt to answer. We shall not try to formulate any hard and fast classification of recognition scenes; but we shall have something to say in regard to Professor Perrin's classification, for, in spite of the fact that he has brought valid objections to Aristotle's classification, we do not feel that his own is impervious to criticism.

Over against Aristotle's statement that "a Discovery using signs as a means of assurance is less artistic, as indeed are all such as imply reflexion"¹ we may set Professor Perrin's statement that "recognition of the highest art are the result of proof conveyed indirectly, preferably without the use of signs and tokens, although by no means necessarily so".² The dramatist, however, will not accept either of these views. Of course, both in tragedy and in comedy, jewels, or tokens of any kind, which have been placed with a lost child and serve as proof of identity years later, are likely to impress one as having been "planted" on purpose by the playwright—if we may borrow an expressive term from the underworld. However, any recognition scene presupposes concealed identity, and plots constructed upon such a situation are likely to be considered as inartistic by the modern critic. On generally accepted canons of taste, we might be tempted to discard the whole procedure as inartistic, were it not for the fact that to say that any dramatic situation is inartistic, irrespective of the way it is handled, is dangerously dogmatic. Therefore, for this very reason, to say that proof of identity conveyed indi-

¹ 1454 b 28.

² Loc. cit.

rectly is the best form of anagnorisis is to be dangerously and unnecessarily dogmatic. If one considers Balzac's Colonel Chabert, or Arnold Bennett's Buried Alive, one realizes that, both in Balzac's tragic situation and in Bennett's comic situation, the interest arises from the very fact that the direct formal proof of the hero's identity is very difficult. In both of these cases, the problem is to make not only formal proof but legal proof; and to hold that the production of such proof is less artistic than to have the hero convey the proof of his identity indirectly, is to make the word artistic depend upon a negligible technicality. No dramatist will admit that a scene in which direct proof of identity is demanded and given is foreordained to be less dramatic than a scene of indirect proof. And for the playwright, the dramatic is the artistic.

Furthermore, when Professor Perrin places the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope in his class of indirect, informal, and artistic recognition scenes, we doubt the entire validity of his classification. Penelope stubbornly refuses to believe in the identity of Odysseus; but she finally says to Eurycleia: "Make up his massive bed outside that stately chamber which he himself once built. Move the massive frame outside." Then Homer adds: "She said this to prove her husband." It makes little difference whether Odysseus knows that she is cleverly putting him to the test. She is demanding proof. The situation is very different from the recognition of Iphigenia by Orestes in which the proof is conveyed indirectly when Iphigenia, with no *arrière pensée* whatsoever, gives the letter to Pylades; but Penelope knows that she is testing Odysseus. She, the cunning Greek, is tacitly doing the same thing with Odysseus which Professor Perrin criticizes Iphigenia, a cunning Greek, for doing openly when she doubts the identity of Orestes. She is demanding formal proof. Yet, Professor Perrin places the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope and the recognition of Iphigenia by Orestes in the same artistic class, whereas he relegates the recognition of Orestes by Iphigenia to a less artistic class. We fail to see that the fact that Orestes knows that he is being put to a test by Iphigenia and that Odysseus does not know that Penelope "said this to prove her husband", makes the latter situation more artistic than the former.

Thus we regard the classifications, both of Aristotle and of Professor Perrin, as being rather unimportant. The means by which the recognition is brought about cannot be judged by any abstract so-called artistic considerations. They must be judged by concrete considerations depending upon the particular dramatic considerations at hand.

We find confirmation for this point of view when Aristotle makes the categorical statement, without mentioning the means by which the recognition is brought about, that "the finest form of discovery is one attended by Peripeties like that which goes with the Discovery in Oedipus This, with a Peripety, will arouse either pity or fear [sympathy or suspense]—actions of that nature being what Tragedy is assumed to represent".¹

This statement is also significant because it gives evidence that anagnorisis was felt by Aristotle to be of dramatic value, since, combined with a peripeteia, it arouses the three dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. Furthermore, Aristotle says: "A Discovery using signs as a means of assurance is less artistic as indeed are all such as imply reflection; whereas one bringing them in all of a sudden (*ἐκ πεπιτελεῖς*), as in the Bath story, is of a better order."² He had said before, in dealing with the deed of horror: "A better situation than that, however, is for the deed to be done in ignorance and the relationship discovered afterwards, since there is nothing odious in it, and the *Discovery will serve to astound us.*"³ Finally, we may quote the following words: "The best of all Discoveries, however, is that arising from the incidents themselves, when the *great surprise* comes about through a

¹ 1452 a 32 ff.

² 1454 b 28 ff. We agree with Bywater in regard to the translation of *ἐκ πεπιτελεῖς* following Victorius, "repentino quodam casu". Bywater rejects Tyrwhitt: "quae ex peripeteia oriuntur", claiming that Aristotle is not using the word in a technical sense. Moore also translates it "suddenly or unexpectedly" and cites Ritter "ex inopinato casu". Twining gives: "suddenly and casually" and cites Victorius: "sed *ἐκ πεπιτελεῖς* significat casu fortuito, et quia ita cecidit. Heinsius says: "quae e mutationibus in contrarium oriuntur. Butcher's "turn of incident" and Lane Cooper's "turn of events" are unsatisfactory because they are somewhat indefinite.

³ 1454 a 2 ff.

probable incident."¹ It seems very plain from these passages that, in Aristotle's opinion, the dramatic value of anagnorisis, combined with a peripeteia, depends upon the fact that it arouses sympathy, suspense, and surprise. We shall now try to show that this is the dramatic value possessed, in varying degree, by all the recognition scenes in Greek Tragedy.

IV.

No one will deny that there is a difference in dramatic value between the recognition scene in the *Helen* and the scene in the *Oedipus Rex*. However, to describe the anagnorisis in the *Helen* as "spontaneous, without delay, without proof" and the anagnorisis in the *Oedipus Rex* as "indirect, informal and artistic", is rather meaningless to the dramatist.² Moreover, if we understand correctly the meaning of the terms Professor Perrin uses in regard to the recognition scene in the *Helen*, it seems that we must remove the scene from this class. Helen, after believing Menelaus to be dead, hears from Theonoe that he lives. Menelaus arrives at Pharos, accompanied by a woman whom he believes to be the real Helen; but he is informed that Helen is at Pharos. This arouses suspense as to whether the husband and wife will meet. At last, they face each other. This increases the suspense, the question now being, whether they will recognize each other. Both are struck by the resemblance; but Euripides does not allow the suspense to end by any "spontaneous" recognition, as he does in his *Electra* when Orestes is recognized by a minor character, the Paedagogue. When the hero and heroine carry on the recognition scene, Euripides is far too clever a dramatist to allow the chance to escape of playing the note of suspense by failing to delay the anagnorisis. Helen flees toward the tomb. Menelaus drags her back. They scan each other once more. Do they both recognize each other? Not yet. Helen is convinced; but Menelaus says:

What makes me doubt
Is this; because I have another wife.

¹ 1455 a 16. Aristotle does not contradict himself here in regard to the "best" Discovery. He is speaking of the way in which the Discovery is made, whereas in 1452 a 32, he is discussing Discovery in general.

² Perrin, loc. cit.

Helen tries to convince him of her identity, saying :

To the domain of Troy I never went:
It was my image only.

But that statement is not proof for Menelaus. Finally come the lines :

Helen. Will you then leave me here, and bear away
The shadow of a wife?

Men. Yet, O farewell,
Because thou art like Helen.

Menelaus refuses all the evidence and arguments that Helen has to offer; and he is about to leave. Surely there is plenty of "delay" in the scene. More delay would be perilously near overdoing this means of arousing suspense. Finally, when the audience almost despairs of a happy outcome, a messenger brings evidence which constitutes proof for Menelaus, if not for Professor Perrin.¹ This proof lies in the fact that the other Helen has vanished, saying :

.... but Tyndarus' miserable daughter,
Though guiltless, hath unjustly been accused.

This dispels Menelaus' doubt which certainly delayed his recognition of Helen, and aroused much suspense. This scene calls forth sympathy, especially for Helen, and undeniable suspense, which would not have been aroused were both recognitions "spontaneous, without delay, and without proof", as Professor Perrin claims they are. There is not much surprise for the spectators, because Euripides has prepared for the scene,² and one expects a husband and wife to recognize each other. Nothing happens finally contrary to our expectations. The function of the scene, so far as the plot is concerned, is to act as the exciting incident of the action, or the incident which sets the action in motion. The real plot of the play is based upon the question : Can the wedded pair escape?

¹ Op. cit., p. 390.

² Euripides indulges in false foreshadowing when he has Helen say :

Wore my husband living
We might have known each other, by producing
Those tokens to which none beside are privy.

Tokens are not used as proof in this scene.

In the Oedipus Rex we have an example of an anagnorisis combined with a peripeteia—a situation upon which Aristotle put his unqualified stamp of approval. There is no finer technical handling of a scene in all dramatic art. The plot of the play rests upon the attempt to solve the question as to whether the murderer of Laius can be discovered. Sophocles has not told us the real identity of Oedipus, and our pre-knowledge of the story must not influence us in our technical analysis of the play. Thus, from a dramatic point of view, we believe that Oedipus is the son of Polybus and Merope. The dramatist has also taken good care to nullify partially the impression made upon the spectators by the accusation of Tiresias. The messenger comes to relieve Oedipus of his fears. In a speech full of marvelous dramatic suspense, every word the messenger utters seems to reassure us, were it not for the fact that Jocasta at last recognizes Oedipus and warns him, in words of unmistakable meaning, to inquire no further into the secret. Our suspense is perfect. Then comes the Herdsman and the recognition is complete. The disclosure arouses our deepest sympathy for the unfortunate, and almost innocent, husband and wife, son and mother. The peripeteia comes with astounding surprise, as the audience sees hope vanish before the awful truth. It is a perfect *coup de théâtre*, bringing in its wake a nerve-racking emotion. The function of the scene is to serve as climax.

This recognition scene is of greater dramatic value than the anagnorisis in the Helen for two reasons. In the first place, the suspense is ended in the Helen without surprise, whereas in the Oedipus Rex it ends with an astounding peripeteia. In the second place, the scene in the Helen comes early in the play, whereas in the Oedipus Rex it forms the climax. Also the peripeteia in the Oedipus Rex constitutes a complete and final *μεράβασις*; and any spectator will be more impressed by an anagnorisis ending with such a peripeteia than by one which leaves the situation capable of further development, and perhaps of a different outcome. Thus, there is little wonder that Aristotle was impressed strongly by this scene; and it is not strange, that, knowing such a moment in drama, he insisted upon the value of the recognition scene. There are other ways of arousing sympathy, suspense, and surprise:

but, under the influence of this scene, Aristotle insisted so much upon the element of recognition and not enough upon the element of suspense that he misled later critics into the belief that one of the *means* of arousing sympathy and suspense was more important than the *aim* of arousing these emotions. From the analysis of the situation in this play we can see why he approved of the recognition scenes: because they sometimes brought him to the highest pitch of emotion, and not because one person was recognizing another spontaneously or through direct or indirect proof.

The *anagnorisis* in the *Iphigenia in Tauris* is plainly one which calls forth sympathy for the brother and sister and arouses suspense in regard to their fate. Iphigenia, more than willing to sacrifice a Greek, confronts Orestes and begins to question him about her family. One thinks that such leading questions will bring out the truth; but the dramatist avoids putting an end to our suspense and, indeed, stresses the hopelessness of the situation, as is correct in a play with an unhappy ending.¹ Indeed, Iphigenia, after failing to discover who Orestes is, leaves the stage, thus deepening the sorrow of the audience and delaying the *anagnorisis*. Only one possibility of escape seems open to Orestes: that he deliver the letter. Even that possibility fades away completely when Pylades consents to act as messenger. At this point in the action nothing remains for Orestes but death. But then comes a surprise, not so astounding as in the *Oedipus Rex*, but still a surprise. With all hope seemingly gone Iphigenia, all of a sudden (*ἐκ περιπτερίας*) bids Pylades deliver

¹The Greek dramatists are such masters of the art of arousing suspense and causing surprise that, as a general rule, they stress the note of fear in a play with a happy ending, such as *Iphigenia in Tauris* and the *Ion*; whereas they stress the note of hope in plays with an unhappy ending, such as the *Oedipus Rex* and the *Agamemnon*. It is probably for this reason that the rule was laid down by later critics, such as Euanthius, and was accepted by the Renaissance critics, that tragedy should have a calm beginning and an unhappy ending, whereas comedy should have a turbulent beginning and a calm ending. Thus Ibsen, who follows the technique of Greek tragedy more closely than any other modern dramatist, begins *The Doll's House* and *Rosmersholm* with a peaceful scene.

the letter "to Orestes", and Orestes recognizes Iphigenia.¹ But Euripides knows how to create suspense, and also how to hold it. Orestes calls Iphigenia, "My sister", but she replies: "My brother! Thou my brother? Wilt thou not unsay those words?" Of course she demands formal proofs. Would anyone do anything else under these circumstances? Is there not every reason for Iphigenia to suspect that this man, who claims to be her brother, is employing a clever ruse to escape death? Professor Perrin says that the "proof is not wrung from him by artful stratagem but is drawn out in wearisome cumulation."² But do we expect that under such an emotional shock a sister is going to pull herself together and devise some artful stratagem in order that the second anagnorisis may be placed in the "artistic" class? Surely such a procedure is not true to life; nor is it true to dramatic art. Euripides has played one theatrical trick, and has played it so well that it becomes an excellent *coup de théâtre*. Shall we ask him to devise still another one? A Scribe might have done so; but Euripides is not Scribe. When such devices, as that of the letter in Iphigenia in Tauris, are repeated in the same scene, they become what Henry Arthur Jones justly calls "thimblerigging", and the audience becomes painfully conscious of the dramatist's pen. The play becomes false to life and false to high art. Indeed, it is greatly to the credit of Euripides that, having employed one indirect proof without the use of signs, he immediately varies the method and has formal proof demanded. Variety is the spice of drama as well as of life. The suspense and interest of the audience are greatly heightened by the very fact that Iphigenia demands formal proofs. We wonder whether Orestes can produce them.

Certainly we cannot say that this scene produces pity and fear. It brings us into full sympathy with the hero and

¹No spectator would possibly have time during the on-rush of the action to figure out that Iphigenia will have to tell the name of the person to whom the letter is to be sent, and that thus Orestes will recognize her.

²Op. cit., p. 397. We can only reply that the scene given in Mr. Granville Barker's production of the play was full of suspense and by no means wearisome. The dialogue at this point moves with great swiftness. The final test of a scene is the impression it makes upon an audience in a theatre, not upon the individual critic at his desk.

heroine. The fear that it produces is simply the element of fear that enters into all suspense. When the scene is over, the fear on the part of the audience is much lessened. Orestes is saved from one danger, for there is a peripeteia attendant upon this anagnorisis; but the problem of Orestes' escape is not solved. The anagnorisis in the Iphigenia in Tauris neither sets the action in motion, as it does in the Helen, nor does it serve as climax, as it does in the Oedipus Rex. The scene is a step in the development of the plot.

In the Ion the principal anagnorisis is delayed until the end of the play since the problem presented by the plot is whether Creusa must remain childless. The function of this recognition scene is to serve as dénouement, as it does in New Comedy, for the play is practically over the moment that Creusa recognizes Ion. The first scene, early in the play, in which Creusa questions Ion, immediately arouses suspense; and, as it is a possible recognition scene, in which the recognition does not take place, we fear throughout the whole tragedy that Creusa may never recognize Ion as her son, especially as Ion himself forbids her to question Apollo in regard to her son. A scene of this kind differs from real anagnorisis only in the fact that the recognition is not accomplished. It arouses the same sympathy and suspense, but it simply does not end the suspense. This scene in the Ion performs the function of exposition in an excellent manner because the best form of exposition is to unfold the situation during a scene of suspense.

Also, we have in this play another kind of anagnorisis, not mentioned by Aristotle, namely, a false recognition by Xuthus of Ion as his son. This leads to further complication of the plot as it causes the intention on the part of Creusa to slay Ion. This complication, in turn, causes the intention on the part of Ion to kill Creusa. This situation, together with the recognition, constitutes practically one of the best dramatic situations according to Aristotle, who holds that the best handling of the deed of horror is one in which some one is on the point of slaying another in ignorance of the relationship and makes the discovery in time to draw back.¹ It is the Pythian Priestess who holds back the hand of Ion, but the

¹ 1454 a 4.

recognition of Ion by Creusa comes a moment later when the Priestess discloses to the mother's view the wicker chest in which the mother had placed the child at birth. Thus the effect of the scene is like the effect of the situation of which Aristotle approves so highly. These two recognition scenes are parallel to the recognition scenes in the Iphigenia in Tauris, for naturally Ion demands formal proof of his mother's identity. Professor Perrin comments: "There is scarcely a doubt that both scenes were popular with Athenian audiences, which enjoyed play and counter-play of cunning; but the element of directness in the elongated proof robs them of a high artistic excellence".¹ But the real question is whether the element of elongated proof robs them of dramatic excellence. Do these scenes arouse less suspense because a direct proof is required? For reasons stated above we cannot admit it. As in the recognition scene of Orestes by Iphigenia, it seems both natural and good technically for Ion to demand direct formal proof and that for him to do otherwise would be false psychologically. Perhaps again a Scribe could have devised some "artful stratagem" for Ion to employ so that the scene could be placed in the "artistic" class; but if, as Professor Perrin admits, the highly intelligent Athenian audience enjoyed the scene, and since the scene is certainly not untrue to life, what more can one demand?²

¹ Op. cit., p. 401.

² It may seem that I imply by these statements that the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope is inartistic and false psychologically; but the situations are not entirely similar. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus has not suddenly recognized Penelope through any indirect means and has not straightway burst forth upon her with the claim of his identity, in which case she would probably have said, as do Ion and Iphigenia: "Prove it!" Homer takes good care to tell us that Penelope is dazed, having awakened from a sound sleep. He insists that she cannot speak because she is dazed with wonder. Were the situation exactly parallel to the situation in the *Iphigenia in Tauris* and the *Ion*, and had Homer employed indirect proof for both recognitions, he would have been in great danger of indulging in Scribian legerdemain and "thimble-rigging". But the situations are not similar; and, whatever we may think of direct or indirect proof, the technical and hence the artistic problem changes when two recognitions are necessary in the same scene. In no extant Greek tragedy does a dramatist employ the same method for two recognitions.

Professor Perrin says of the recognition of Electra by Orestes in the Choephoroe: "Orestes conjectures Electra from her issuing out of the palace at the head of a company of slaves, and his conjecture becomes a certainty when he overhears her prayers for her brother's return. This is indirect and highly artistic proof (*εξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων*) . . ."¹ This statement is not in accordance with the facts in the case. What really happens is that Orestes, having placed a votive lock of hair on his father's tomb, sees the procession of the maidens come forth and asks if they come "to sooth the ancient anger of the dead with sweet libations for my father's tomb". He answers his own question: "'Tis even so: for lo! Electra comes." There is not a shadow of doubt in the words of Orestes. He sees his sister and recognizes her "spontaneously, without delay and without proof", as Professor Perrin would have said had he been more attentive to the real situation. The scene must, therefore, be removed from the classification of "indirect, informal and artistic, without the use of signs", in which it is placed by Professor Perrin. However, the scene has a dramatic value of bringing a pleasurable surprise and of arousing suspense for the next scene. The recognition takes place so quickly that there is little time for suspense during the anagnoris.

The recognition of Orestes by Electra has been criticized as inartistic from Euripides down to the modern critic. It is true that the signs, the hair and the footprint, are somewhat naïve and lend themselves easily to burlesque; but the scene is dramatic. We grant the naïveté resident in the likeness of the hair and the footprints of the brother and sister, yet the proof is produced in accordance with the law of probable or necessary sequence of events. We know that Orestes is near at hand and that the signs are at the tomb as Electra approaches. We hope that she will recognize them. We undergo suspense; and when she discovers them and, through them, the identity of Orestes, we are in full sympathy with the brother and sister. We certainly do not pity them.

Also we find another recognition scene in this play, which Professor Perrin does not mention, when Clytaemnestra recognizes Orestes. The first time that they face each other

¹ Op. cit., p. 386.

the recognition does not take place, but we are in great suspense lest Clytaemnestra discover the identity of her son. Finally, however, Clytaemnestra comes to the awful realization that the stranger, who has brought the news of the death of Orestes, is Orestes himself, her son. Clytaemnestra enters and says to the wailing servant :

Cly. Well! what's the matter? why this clamorous cry?
 Serv. He, who was dead, has slain the quick. 'Tis so.
 Cly. Ha! Thou speakest riddles; but I understand thee.

This is a dramatic moment of tremendous emotional shock; and this recognition performs the important function of leading to the great obligatory scene and climax of the play, when Orestes enters quickly and faces his mother. Who cares to analyze the scene to see how Clytaemnestra came to the conclusion by a process of reasoning : "Some one has slain Aegisthus. The only one who would slay Aegisthus is Orestes. Hence, this stranger is Orestes". The manner of the recognition is entirely unimportant. We will say, however, that the swiftness and directness of the recognition at this point in the action is drama of the highest art. The anagnorisis has already been delayed up to this moment; but further delay for the sake of suspense, just before the obligatory scene, would be most inartistic and undramatic. This recognition scene is a wonderful *coup de théâtre* expressed in three lines.

In the Euripidean version of this play it is true, as Professor Perrin says, that Orestes learns the identity of Electra from her words of lamentation. When Electra enters, Orestes believes her to be a slave; and he withdraws for a moment, with the intention of questioning her later. Overhearing her lament, he recognizes her. Professor Perrin calls this recognition of her identity "indirect and artistic".¹ It is certainly indirect, but there is scarcely anything more inartistic in drama than for a character to gain information by overhearing a monologue. This method of bringing about a recognition is to be criticized adversely far more than the method employed by Aeschylus in the same situation, which Professor Perrin says is so "artificial as to be ridiculous".²

¹ Op. cit., p. 404.

² Op. cit., p. 387.

We can see very plainly, however, throughout the whole scene in the Electra, the technique of the more sophisticated dramatist, Euripides. When Orestes has recognized Electra, the playwright holds back the recognition of Orestes by Electra as long as possible, and he wrings the last drop of suspense from the situation. Orestes meets Electra, but does not disclose his identity even after he is sure of Electra's state of mind. At last, after the scenes with Auturgus and after a choral ode, the old paedagogue is brought in and he quickly recognizes Orestes. Electra naturally demands proofs. Having seen and talked with the man beforehand, it would be strange if she suddenly became convinced without proof. Where Aeschylus is brief, Euripides is long because he has learned the value of suspense. The recognition of Orestes by Clytaemnestra in this play is behind the scenes. Thus Euripides misses an obligatory scene.

In the Sophoclean version of the story the emotional and dramatic value of the scene is greatly increased by the fact that Electra has been led to believe by the story of the Paedagogue that Orestes is dead. The audience, however, knows that he is living and that he has gone to Agamemnon's tomb. Thus, when Crysothemis hurries to Electra with the glad tidings that Orestes lives and that he has placed a votive offering on the tomb, the audience expects Electra to believe her; but Electra, impressed by the report of the death of Orestes, refutes her story. When Orestes places in Electra's hands the urn supposedly containing his own ashes, the audience awaits the recognition more breathlessly than it does in the versions of Aeschylus and Euripides. In the Sophoclean version each of the principal characters is ignorant of the other's identity and thus there is a strong possibility that the recognition may not take place; whereas in the other versions, Orestes has already recognized Electra and the recognition of Orestes is only a matter of time. Also, in the Sophoclean play, the audience awaits with pleasurable expectation the joy of Electra when she finds that Orestes is alive. The scene is difficult to equal in its suspense and sympathy. It rises in perfect gradation of intensity to the climax, when Orestes, convinced by Electra's grief of her identity, discloses himself.

The scenes in the three versions perform somewhat different functions in regard to the plot. In the Choephoroe, the func-

tion is least important. As Professor Perrin says, the recognition scene in this tragedy is "a mere preliminary leading up to the all absorbing crisis of matricide".¹ In the other plays the anagnorisis is so developed as to become an integral part of the plot. It is the scene from which the smouldering motive of revenge bursts into flame.

In the Bacchae and in the Hercules Furens there are recognition scenes which have not been discussed by Professor Perrin, but which are very important because they are connected with the second best method of handling the deed of horror according to Aristotle. The deed is done in ignorance and the relationship is discovered afterwards. Thus there is nothing odious in it and "the Discovery will serve to astound us".² Thus in the Bacchae, Agave slays Pentheus in ignorance and then discovers that he is her son. In the Hercules Furens, Hercules slays his wife and children and discovers their identity afterwards. It cannot be argued that there is no element of surprise whatsoever in these scenes because the audience knows the identity of the slain people. The spectators undergo the emotions of the hero in a well written play. When the audience realizes that Agave and Hercules may recognize the dead children, sympathy is aroused, suspense is created and the astounding discovery made by Agave and Hercules finds a response in the heart of the spectator.

V.

Thus the anagnorisis in these plays arouses in varying degree of intensity the three great emotions of dramatic art: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. If anyone believes that this is inevitably the case with the recognition scene, one has only to turn to comedy in which the anagnorisis is merely a device to bring about a happy ending. There may be some slight element of surprise in the discovery of relationship in comedy; but certainly the anagnorisis in comedy is not consciously and purposely employed to arouse sympathy or suspense or surprise as it is in tragedy. Also, in Terence, the recognition scene is so unimportant that it sometimes occurs behind the scenes, as in the Eunuchus, Heautontimoroumenos, and

¹ Op. cit., p. 395.

² 1453 b.

Hecyra; or it is practically narrated, as in the Phormio, or is between the wrong characters as in the Andria.

Thus the recognition scene in Greek tragedy performs various functions in regard to the plot, such as exposition and preparation (*Choephoroe*), exciting incident (*Helen*), a step in the development of the plot or action (*Electra*), climax (*Oedipus Rex*), dénouement (*Ion*). The dramatic value of anagnorisis has nothing to do with the manner in which the recognition is brought about; but the value depends upon the amount of sympathy, suspense, and surprise that it arouses, and upon the function in regard to the development of the action. We agree with Aristotle that the finest form of anagnorisis is one caused by the probable or necessary sequence of events and is combined with a peripeteia, for thus combined it will arouse the fundamental dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

III.—WEST GERMANIC PRETERITS WITH ē² FROM IE ēI.¹

I. One of the problems of the VIIth verbal Ablaut Series lies in the phonetic difficulty that IE ēI was longer maintained in the preterit of certain Germanic verbs than in the present. Brugmann's solution, compactly stated in advance, is that, in the IE present LĒI-DETI, the open syllable LĒI yielded LĒ¹ in the Germanic primate *lē-tō (cf. OEng. infin. *lētan* 'to let'); but at a later time, in the present LĒID-MI, the closed syllable LĒID- yielded Germanic *lē²t. For this assumption the only evidence is the open syllable of the Germanic primate *lē²te, in OEng. preterit *lēt*. The writer, who is not a Germanist, conceives the problem differently and will attempt to show, first, a fairly frequent IE alternation (here not meaning gradation) so distributed as to tense as to be susceptible to the formulation pres. ē: pf. ēi (*əi*). He will also assume that, like reduplication and o-vocalism and special person endings, this diphthongal character may have been seized on as an earmark, by no means obligatory, of the perfect tense system. This auxiliary proposition does not require argument, for the principle is but an aspect of analogy and a like fact is already admitted as a formative principle for the weak stem in Sanskrit perfects. In Sanskrit, the weak perfect stem of the root *sad* is generally, and perhaps correctly, explained from SE-SD-, yielding Skr. *sed-*, in which e is a secondary diphthong like ē in *els*, from IE SEMS. In Indo-Iranian the weak perfect stem *yait-* in Skr. *yete*, Av. *yaēte* (: *yat*), is derived from IE YE-YT-. From these and like etymologically justified alternations of pres. a: pf. e the Sanskrit weak e-perfects are thought to have spread, almost without limit, over the entire verb system. Of course, the

¹ References. Streitberg, Urgerman. Gram.¹, § 79; § 216, 1; p. 371-2, Noreen, Urgerman. Lautlehre, § 10, 1. Wright, Old English Grammar, § 125; §§ 511-514. Brugmann, Kurze vergleich. Gram., § 147, Anm.; Grundriss i,² § 226 u. Anm.; ii³, 3, § 403 u. Anm.

perfect stem *yaɪt-* may really have existed as IE *YEIT*, so that the correlation of pres. *YETE-*: pf. *YEIT-* would have been proethnic. Sanskrit has six such roots beginning with *ya-*. Likewise the Skr. perfect *sede* might be referred to IE *səm*: the root *SĒID* 'to sit', as once and still set down by the authorities. So by Brugmann, Gr. i, § 549 c, and by Brugmann-Thumb, Griech. Gram.⁴, p. 332, Anm.

2. In further demonstration of IE $\bar{\alpha}^x_i$ preterits (perfects): $\bar{\alpha}^x$ presents I will first adduce three Sanskrit perfects, referring for the quantity of material in support of synonymous roots in $\ddot{E}/\bar{E}I$ to Noreen, op. cit., § 58, 2.

(i) 3d pl. pf. act. *cedus* 'ceciderunt': Welsh *cwyddo* 'cado', from Celtic **keidð*, see Fick-Stokes Wbch., p. 75.

(ii) 1st sg. pf. mid. *mene* 'puto' (putavi): Germ. *meinen*.

(iii) 1st sg. pf. mid. *tene* 'tetendi': *tau-via* 'band'.

In all three instances the Skr. *e*-perfects belong to $\bar{\alpha}^x_i$ -roots, associated with Skr. *a*-roots. The Sanskrit correlation of *a*: *e* turns on roots of the type of *SĒIK* 'to cut' (in Lat. *sīca* 'dagger', where *ic* may come from *ĒIK* >*ēik*, or contain IE *ĒI*: *əI/I*): *SEK* (in Lat. *secat*). See further Reichelt in KZ 39, 14 sq. Nobody doubts the correlation *ĒI*: *əI/I*, and Reichelt's lists justify $\bar{E}I$ and even \ddot{E} as well. And now to take up our examples in more detail:

3. i. If Irish *srēdim* 'I throw' goes back to SPRĒI-DH- (so Brugmann, Gr. i, § 931), Welsh *cwyddo* (*wy*< $\bar{E}I$) legitimately derives from *KĒI-D-*, an extension of the root (*s*) $\bar{k}(H)\bar{E}I$ (*s*) $\bar{k}(H)\bar{E}I^1 'caedere'.$

4. ii. Just as OHG. *sceidan* comes from IE SKƏI-DH-, OHG. *meinen* comes from MƏI-N-, an *n*-extension of MĒ(I),

⁴ For a quick survey of the Protean varieties of this root the reader is referred to Boisacq, Dict. étym. de la langue grecque, s. v. *σχέτω*.

"The absurdity of Walde's refusal to admit the correlation of Lat. *caedit*—identical with Av. *saид* 'scindere', from (*s*) $\bar{k}(H)\bar{E}I$ -D- (see for the type AJPh. 37, 170, § 28)—with *scindit* will be revealed to any one who will read for its semantics Walde's own entry under *ferio*; and, for its phonetics, to the reader of his remarks on *caelum* and *scio*. Long ago, in AJPh. 26, 397; cf. ib. 174, I illustrated the semantic correlation between 'cuts' and 'falls' (*caedit* and *cadit*) by OIr. *do-ro-chair* 'cecedit': Skr. *çṛṇāti* 'crushes', pass. *çṛnyātē* (cf. the equivalent active *çṛṇāti* 'decidit'); and by Lith. *krintù* 'cado': Skr. *kṛṇtāti* 'caedit'. Here add Lat. *cāsus* 'fall', which is certainly from IE *kātrus*; and Goth. *driusan* 'cadere': *θpauēi* 'çṛṇāti'.

in Av. *mā(y)* 'metiri', cf. *mē-d-* in Lat. *meditor*: OIr. *midíur* 'iudico, aestimo, puto' (see Uhlenbeck, Got. Wbch. s. v. *mitan*). That *ME-N*, as well as *ME-D*, is an extension of *MĒI* need not be doubted. This question, however, is not important here, but only the synonymy of *MEN* with *MĒI*. Thus *meinan* belongs with IE *māi-néti* (type of Skr. *mrnáti*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. ii, 3, § 211 sq.; Goth. *skeinan*, OHG. *scinan* have *i*: *ai*, though *ei* is possible; see also AJPh. 37, 161, § 15 sq.), which meant 'measures, calculates, reckons, thinks'. Also note O Bulg. *mē-niti*, which Berneker (Slav. Etym. Wbch. ii, p. 49) also derives from *māi-N-*. As to its form, Skr. *mene* 'puto' is ultimately a pres. middle from *māi-né-ti*; cf. on the syntactical problem Speyer, Ved. u. Skr. Syntax, § 175.

5. iii. Skr. *tan* 'ten-dere' has a by-form *tāy*, and it is to the latter that *tau-via* obviously belongs. Note the formal proportion Skr. *mene*: Av. *māy* 'metiri' :: Skr. *tene*: *tāy*.

6. Certainly the Sanskrit perfects *cedus*, *mene*, *tene* contain a diphthong that admits of interpretation as proethnic *ai*, and it will appear in the sequel that this *ai* in the weak perfect stem (in middles and plural actives) probably alternated with *ei* (*Āi*) in the strong stem. Our forms admit of being rubricated as *āxi*-perfects: *āx*-presents.

7. From Greek also I will adduce three preterits in *eu* (*eu*) from roots with *ēi* (*Āi*), under conditions that admit of interpreting the *eu* (*eu*) as normal Greek shortenings of *ēi* *Āi* before consonants. The cases are:

8. i. Pres. *δατέομαι* (: *DĀI* 'dividere'): Cretan pf. *δέθαισμα*. Because of the reduplication this instance is not necessarily typical of the IE alternation pres. *e*: pf. *āi/ei*. Be it remembered, however, that the whole contention for a tense alternation *āx*: *āxi* rests on the plea of allocation of etymologically justified *āx* and *āxi* to tense function, that is to say, rests precisely on such groups as *δατέομαι*: *δέθαισμα*.

9. ii. Ion. *η-νεικα*/Aeol. *η-νίκα*: *ē-reukēiv* (see Brugmann-Thumb, op. cit., p. 322).—a. The identity of *η-νεικα* with Skr. *a-námga* (classified under *ag*, but certainly from *naç* 'adipisci') is one of the inexpugnable data of IE linguistics. The *η-* is certainly the preverb *ē* (cf. *ēveikerau* in Hesiod) and, so far as the root may be written *ENEK*, its *E-* is like the *ē* of *ēthēw*. The primate of Skr. *a-namga* was *ē-NE-NKE*. I pass over, not

without admitting its bare semantic possibility, Brugmann's derivation of *ηνεικα* from *έν-σεικα (cf. ίκω/έκω 'venio'), quasi 'inveni'. The root to be sought, however, will have to be the root of νίκη 'victory', but in νίκη-φόρος (cf. νίκην φέρειν, a sort of figura etymologica) also 'prize'; cf. Skr. *bhára-s* 'gewinn, preis, beute': φέρει ("present" of η-νεικα), and note the same figure in Lat. *victoriam reportare*. The root was NĒI- \bar{K} /K, with grade forms NĒIK/NĪK; and the difference between η-νεικα and η-νίκα is to be interpreted as an alternation between a strong stem with ēI and a weak with εI. The proof of a root NĒ(I)K is furnished by Lat. *nac-tus* with a from ε: ē. In Skr. *naç* we have a secondary e-grade root (*naç*: NĒI \bar{K} :: Lat. *secat*: SĒIK). From a form with k (not \bar{k}) we have Lithuanian *pranokti* 'adipisci'. As for Lat. *nanciscor*, it came from the interplay between reduplicated NE-NK- and NĒK (Lat. *nac-*).—b. But η-νεικα is ultimately a perfect of the root NĒ(I) 'ducere, to pull', in Skr. nī, among the meanings of which are 'hinführen, tragen, bringen zu' (Cappeller). A like development of meaning is attested by Eng. *draws* and *drags*: Germ. *trägt* (see e. g. Walde, s. v. *traho*). In middle forms Skr. nī is also defined by 'mit sich führen, . . . n e h m e n¹' (als sieger <cf. νίκη>, eigenthümer, machthaber'). Note the following renderings of -νεικ- forms by 'ducere, to pull'. In λ 265, ἀνένεικα = reduxi (Cerberum ad terram); Ε 255 = O 28, ἀπένεικας = abduxisti (Herculem); E 885, ὑπήνεικαν . . . πόδες = <me> subduxerunt pedes; π 326 = 360 ἀπένεικαν = 'they pulled <and then bore> off (the arms)'. In Latin nī-t-or 'I pull, strive', etc. (not to be confounded with *gnitor* 'I kneel') the root NĒI is also preserved; cf. Lith. nī-k-ti 'vehementer incipere'. In the preterit ē νει-κα we may find the source of the \bar{k}/k of the root *nek*/ \bar{k} , cf. ē-δω-κα and Lat. fē-ci: *fac-io*.

10. iii. Attic-Ionic (*f*) *εἰπα* 'dixi', Gortynian *προ-φευτάω*. One can hardly doubt that the three Indo-Iranian roots represented in Skr. *vac* 'canere, vocare', *vad* 'dicere' and Av. *vaf*²

¹ Goth. *niman* is from NEM, a by-root to NĒ(I); cf. Skr. *gam*: GĀ, Lat. *prem-it*: *ex-prē-tus* (see KZ. 43, 154); and the plural perfect stem is from nē[i]-m-.

² Because of Gāthic Av. *vafu-*, and pres. stem *ufya-*, Bartholomae writes the root as *vaf* (*f* from PH). But the *f* originated in Avestan from -*fv-* <*pv* in case-forms of *vafu* and from -*fy-* <*py* in *ufya-*.

'besingen', are parallel roots. Bartholomae in his lexicon rightly explains *vap* from the sense of 'weben', comparing Skr. *váyati* 'weaves, plaits' a song; cf. Γ 212, μύθοις ὑφανον "they began to weave the web of words" (Lang, Leaf, Myers). Skr. *vác-* and *vácas-* keep the sense of 'song', and *śeṣa* is Epic song. We find the root *wēi-d-* (: Skr. *vad*, IE *WED*) in *ā-eidōs ā-oidós ā-ηdóv*, cf. *pañc-pañdós* 'stitching songs' > 'bard'. As a concluding argument that *feiṇa* has a genuine *ēi*-diphthong let Lat. *con-victum* 'wrangling, abuse, insult' serve. We find in Greek, with *ēv-* (cf. *ēy-yelāv*, *ēv-vβptlēv*), *ēv-(f)τηνή* 'convictum': *ēv-ēπτω* 'convictor, insector' (? : Lat. root *sec* 'dicere').

11. To sum up the results of the previous discussion: IE preterits with *i*-diphthong may be noted as follows:

(1) preterits in *ēi* (type of Skr. *yete*, § 1) : presents in *ē* (Skr. *yátati*), analogically extended perhaps to other than *YE*-roots.

- (2) a. preterits in *ēi*, type of *ēi-veuka feiṇa*.
- b. " in *ai*, type of Skr. *tené sede* (§ 1).
- c. " in *i*, type of *ēi-vtka*.

All being preterits to roots in *ĒI*, beside which stood parallel roots in *Ē¹*.

(3) *ēi* preterits (type of *ēi-deiça*) : *ēi* roots.

(4) *ē[i]* preterits : presents in *ē* (Goth. *nēm-um* : *niman*). I need not tediously point out to the reader that, by virtue of their common terms, shifts and shunts might be expected between all the members of these preterits : present groups. This observation will account for the phenomena that may be typified as the STEG/STEIG alternations (on STEG: STEIG see Lidén in IF. 18, 500).

12. We are now in a position to consider from a new angle of vision the VIIth Germanic Ablaut series, in so far as verb roots with *ĒI* are involved. Here the phenomenon to be accounted for is that the second group of roots in *ĒI* yielded in the present *ē¹*, written as Germanic (=OEng.) *æ*; but in

¹We cannot tell whether *tene* came from *TINAI* or from *TEINAL*. Greek *τείνω* seems to me no less likely to have come from *ΤΕΙΝΟ* than from *TENYD* (on the *e*-vocalism see Brugmann, Gr. ii, 3, § 226 sq.; Arm. *dñem* from a stem *DHĒ-NO-*, ib. § 228). I know of no proof that aor. *teine* 'he pulled, drew, stretched' is from *TĒN-S-E, rather than from *TEINE*.

the preterit \bar{e}^2 (West-Germanic \bar{e}). In the first group of this Ablaut series \bar{e}^2 preterits match presents in əɪ , i. e. prim. Germ. ai (OEng. a). Here again we are dealing with $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ roots, but the presents, instead of having the strong form in $\bar{\text{ɛ}}[1]$, now have reduced vocalism. The root of pres. infin. *scādan*: pret. *scēd* is SKHĒIDH ‘to cut, separate’ and *scādan* has the vocalism of Lat. *caedit* (§ 3, fn.). The root of pret. *hēt*: *hātan* (‘to call’) was KĒI-D-, cf. Lat. *cī-re*, *κτ-νεῖν*, from the simpler root KĒI ‘ire’ (not κλί as Bezzengerer has it in KZ. 47, 82), cf. Lat. *bu-cētūm* ‘cow-heath’: Goth. *haipi* ‘field’ (semantics as in Av. *čarāna-* ‘field’: Skr. *car* ‘errare’; cf. Lat. *agri-cola* ‘field-tiller’). Taking pret. *lēc*: *lācan*, Wright’s remaining instance, the root LĒI-G- will satisfy all the phonetic conditions presented in the cognate words, cf. e. g. Boisacq s. v. *ձևալի՛ւ*.

13. Any phonetic solution of the conflict between \bar{e}^1 in OEng. *lētan* but \bar{e}^2 in pret. *lēt* must face the fact that IE $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ is widely represented by Germ. \bar{e}^2 in nouns and other words of such large syllabic range that we are bound to admit that the mother speech delivered into primitive Germanic a relatively large number of words with $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$, and that this $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$, contrary to Brugmann’s assumption (§ 1), remained intact ($>\bar{e}^2$) in open syllables everywhere, save in the present tense of verbs.¹ We may reconcile, then, the conflict typified by OEng. *lētan*: pret. *lēt* by saying:

A. That the pre-Germanic alternation² pret. $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$: pres. $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ was analogically shifted to pret. $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$: pres. \bar{e} by influence of pret. $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$:³ pres. \bar{e} in other forms (cf. § 11, 1 and 2).

14. Our first solution has been to find a diphthongal character for the IE preterit as compared with the present, and thereby to justify the Germanic presents in $\bar{\text{ɛ}}[1]$ ($>\bar{e}^1$) beside the preterits in $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ ($>\bar{e}^2$). But there is a second, and it may

¹ The surviving non-verbal $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ forms are rarely, if ever, cognate with verbal $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ forms.

² The term alternation first applies to the tense, only, not to the vocalism.

³ It is to be very expressly noted that in the Germanic change from $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ to \bar{e}^2 we are entitled to insert as intermediary a shortened $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$ which, to prevent confusion with IE $\bar{\text{ɛ}}$, may be written $\bar{\text{ɛ}}\text{̄}$. Cf. the Celtic chain $\bar{\text{ɛ}}\text{̄}>\bar{\text{ɛ}}\text{̄}>\bar{e}$ in § 3.

be concurrent, way to account for the phonetic facts, and that is by saying:

B. That in pre-Germanic IE ēi was reduced to ē¹ in verbs but (and possibly through ē²ⁱ) to ē² in all other parts of speech, in so far as these were not reassociated with the ē¹ verbal forms.

And the rationale of this is simple. The Indo-European verb was, under certain conditions, toneless, so that our statement of the rule may be made in this form: (1) toneless IE ēi yielded Germanic ē¹, (2) accented ē²ⁱ yielded ē². But this brings us again to the difficulty of pret. ē²: pres. ē¹. It so happens, however, that the Indo-European preterits had strong and weak forms, so that in our root LĒID, e. g., we should expect strong forms in LĒID and weak in LĒID (cf. § 5; § 9a), and this weak form is actually maintained in ONorse *leit*, OHG. *firleiz* (see Streitberg, op. cit., p. 333). But in the present, thematic LĒIDE- had no weak variant, though a weak present LĒIDE- graded like Lat. *caedit*, might be admitted. The conclusion of the whole matter results in the formula:

15. Toneless IE ēi in verbs yielded Germanic ē¹, but in the preterit ē¹ was restored to ēi (whence ē²ⁱ>ē²), partly by the influence of the weak stem in ēi; or else maintained by the influence of other diphthongal preterits (§ 11, 1 and 2), in which the diphthong had been fastened on as an earmark.

16. OEng. *mēd* 'meed, prize'. As a pendant to the discussion of the Germanic treatment of ēi, a few words may be added on OEng. *mēd*. I write its primate as MĒI-DHĀ'. There was a metaplastic weak stem MĒIDHO- in Skr. *medhā-sati-s* 'prize-winning', cf. *medhayú-s* 'prize-seeking'.

17. In the compound MĒI-DHĀ MĒI is a root-noun meaning 'measure, exchange' (cf. Lat. *mē-tiōr*) used, like Lat. *de-mēnsum*², of the 'ration (or wage) of food measured out

¹ Perhaps the entire elusive proethnic fluctuation between ē and ēi may be referred to this principle. In that case ēi forms in the IE verb will have been restored analogically from weak stems in ēi, and also by reassocation with nouns and participles having ēi (and conversely). There were also conditions under which the verb had tone, as in dependent clauses, and more especially in composition with prepositions, as in Celtic simple and double compounds, for instance.

² The n of *mēnsus* will have been brought over from an n present, say MĒ-NO-, like Arm. DHĒ-NO- (§ 11, fn.), blended with the t present

periodically to a slave'. The gods, like slaves and kings, also had their measured portions (the tithe of Hercules, e. g.). Other very interesting combinations are made between MĒI 'to measure out, allot; exchange' (= 'measure one thing against another', cf. Lat. *mutuum, mutare*) and DHĒ; cf. Skr. DHĀ 'geben, schenken', Lat. *facere* 'to sacrifice, offer, θέατος 'deposit, earnest money', ἀνάθημα 'offering'. In Av. *myazda-*: Skr. *miyé-dha-* 'offering, sacrificial meal or gift' the prius is IE MIY-ES-/MYES-, quasi 'demonsum'. This prius is further reduced to M̄S in Av. *mīz-da-* 'stipulatum, merces, wage': μωθός 'price'. In Skr. *mē-dha-/mēdhās-* 'sacrifice' the prius is M̄I, or MEI. Note the posterius -das- 'gift' in Skr. *mē-das-* 'offering <of fat>, whence 'fat'. From other senses of MĒI comes the sense of Skr. *me-dhā-* 'sapientia'; cf. the *d* extensions in Lat. *meditor*, Greek μέδομαι, Goth. *mitan*, OIr. *midíur* (§ 4).

18. As regards the flexion of IE MĒIDHĀ, (primate of OEEng. *mēd*), in the oblique cases, say the genitive, -Ā would fall away before the case ending -ES/-OS, so that with proper stem gradation we should have nom. MĒIDHĀ, gen. MĒIDHÉS, and by backwards extension from gen. MĒIDH-ES a new nominative MĒIDH-S. The point is worth making, as it enables us to interpret Lat. *mercēd-* from *merces + d(h)-* (cf. Skr. *miyé-dha-* above). This stem *merces-* may possibly be admitted for *Mercurius*. In Lat. *plā-bēs* we have in the posterius IE -DHĒ alternating with DH in Gen. *plebis*. In *pu-bēs* *puber-is* there is alternation of DHĒ and DHES.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

of *mētior*. Something similar has happened in the history of Lat. *mansus*.

IV.—THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* IN GREEK AND INDIC.¹

The compound negative prefix *an-a-* discussed in this paper appears in at least four Greek words: ἀνά-εθνος, ἀνά-ελπτος, ἀνάγνωστος, ἀνάπνευστος; in three Pāli words: *ana-bhāva*, *anāmata*, *ana-matagga*; and times without number in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India. It also occurs in Avestan. It is composed of the two familiar negative prefixes *an-* (< I-G **n-*- antevocalic) and *a-* (< I-G **n-*- anteconsonantal), the two being welded together, as it were, into one indissoluble mass. There is abundant evidence to prove that in Greek and Pāli it is employed as a reinforced, emphatic negative prefix. On the other hand, in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India, the force of the prefix has clearly weakened and it is employed as a commonplace negative prefix in no respect differing from the simple prefix *an-* or *a-*, being pronounced, indeed, in most of the vernaculars like simple *an-*.

By an extraordinary coincidence of sound and use, the Greek prefix *av-a-* and the Indic prefix *an-a-* develop apparently independently of each other from the same primitives, being sound for sound identical, being used in precisely the same way and with precisely the same force. The prefix is not Indo-Germanic, for it occurs neither in Latin nor in Sanskrit.

A dissyllabic *an-a-* does, indeed, occur in Sanskrit. Böhtlingk and Roth list the following words in which it occurs: *an-akasmāt*, ‘not without a why or a wherefore’, i. e., ‘for a mighty good reason’. *an-akāmamāna*, ‘not killing involuntarily’, i. e., ‘killing in cold blood’. *an-alasa*, ‘not inactive’,

¹No systematic, comprehensive treatment of this prefix has ever been attempted. Brugmann has little to say about it in his *Indogermanische Grammatik*, and still less in his *Griechische Grammatik*. Meyer (*Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie*, i. 188) disposes of the problem by arbitrarily assuming the existence of earlier forms which there is not the slightest reason for believing ever to have existed. Boisacq ignores the problem entirely. For a well considered, although brief, treatment of the subject, see H. A. Hamilton, *The Negative Compounds in Greek*, Johns Hopkins dissertation, Baltimore, 1899.

i. e., 'lively as a cricket', 'busy as a bee'. *an-avadya*, 'not not-to-be-praised', i. e., 'beyond reproach'. *an-avāc*, 'not speechless', i. e., 'talkative', 'loquacious'. *an-aviprayukta*, 'not to be disjoined', 'inseparable'. *an-avrata*, 'not without austerities', i. e., 'austere of the austere'. *an-asūri*, 'not unwise', i. e., 'highly intelligent'.

But this dissyllabic *an-a-* is obviously an entirely different thing from the compound negative prefix *an-a-* described in the first paragraph. Take, for example, the compound *an-alasa*, 'not inactive'. The word is composed of the negative prefix *an-* + the substantive *alasa*. The substantive *alasa* is composed, to be sure, of the negative prefix *a-* + the root *las*. But no sooner is the compound *an-alasa* formed than the negative prefix *a-* of *alasa* ceases to be felt as a negative prefix at all. An agglutinate has been formed which means, not 'not inactive', but 'active in the highest degree', 'lively as a cricket', 'busy as a bee'. The negative prefix *a-* has altogether lost, so to speak, its negative character, its individuality, and the agglutinate *alasd* has no longer any negative aspect whatever. The word *an-alasa*, therefore, is no longer felt as composed of *an-* + *a-* + *-lasa*. In point of fact, and in the strict sense of terms, it no longer contains two negative prefixes, much less a compound negative prefix. It is composed of two elements only: the negative prefix *an-* + the substantive *alasa*. So with the rest of the words listed by Böhtlingk-Roth. They are unusually interesting specimens of litotes, but nothing more.

I. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* IN GREEK.

(a) ἀνά-εδνος, 'with no wedding-gifts at all', Hom. Il. 9. 146, 288; 13. 366. (b) ἀνά-ελπτος, 'utterly unlooked for', Hes. Theog. 660. (c) ἀνά-γνωστος, 'an utter secret', Callim. fr. 422. (d) ἀνά-πνευστος, 'without a particle of breath', Hes. Theog. 797. Suidas (i. 361) mentions ἀνάπταιστον· τὸ μὴ πταιον, 'inoffensum'.

(a) ἀνά-εδνος, 'with no wedding-gifts at all': Il. 9. 146: τάους ήν κ' ἐθέλησι φίλην ἀνάεδνον ἀγέσθω, 'of these, whichever he desires, he may take as his own dear wife with never a thought of a wedding-gift'. Similarly, Il. 9. 288: τάους ήν κ' ἐθέλησθα φίλην ἀνάεδνον ἀγεσθαι. Il. 13. 365 f.: γῆρε δὲ Πριάμῳ θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην Κασσάνδρην ἀνάεδνον. 'And he asked for

one of Priam's daughters, for the fairest of form, Cassandra, never so much as mentioning the subject of a dowry.' Stephanus (*Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, I. 2. 359) says: *Itaque ἀνέδοτος dicitur η πάμπαν δέδοτος*, *Prorsus indotata: ut Eustathius [Il. p. 743, 5] ἀνάγνωστον dici ait τὸν λίαν ἀγνωστον*, priore & significante ἐπίτασι, altero autem στέρησι. On Il. 13. 366, Stephanus remarks: *Petebat sine dote sibi dari; tanto enim ejus flagrabat amore.* Cf. Rzach, *Wiener Studien*, 19 (1897), p. 65.

(b) *ἀνά-ελπιτος*, 'utterly unlooked for': Hes. *Theog.* 660: *Ἄλθομεν, Κρόνουν τις ἄναξ, ἀναελπίτα παύόντες.* [The gods, released from their 'merciless bonds', address Zeus:] 'Here we are, son of Kronos, king, recipients of a boon utterly unlooked for'.

(c) *ἀνά-γνωστος*, 'an utter secret'¹: Callimachus, fragment 422: *μηδὲν ἔθέλω καλὸν ἔχειν ἀνάγνωστον*, 'Nothing that is good, would I keep an utter secret'. This reading is attested by Eustathius (743. 7, 1684. 40). But see O. Schneider, *Callimachea*, vol. ii, pp. 596 ff. Cf. also *Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata, et Fragmenta*, ed. Jo. Augustus Ernesti, *Lugduni Batavorum*, 1761, vol. i, pp. 570 f.

(d) *ἀνά-πνευστος*, 'without a particle of breath', Hes. *Theog.* 793-798:

δε κεν τὴν ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσσῃ
ἀθανάτων, οἱ ἔχοντι κάρη νιφδεντος Ὄλύμπου,
κεῖται νήν τμος τετελεσμένον εἰς ἀναινόν·
οὐδέ πέτρ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρος ἔρχεται ἀσσον
βρώσιος, ἀλλά τε κεῖται ἀνάπνευστος καὶ ἀναῦστος
στρωτοῖς ἐν λεχέσσοι, κακὸν δέ ἐ κόμα καλύπτει.

¹ There is an interesting occurrence of *ἀνάγνωστος* by haplology for *ἀν-ανάγνωστος*, 'illegible', in Dio Cassius, 40. 9. 3: *εἰδέσει δὲ καὶ ἄλλος, δύοτε τι δι' απορρήτων τινὶ ἐπέστελλε, τὸ τέταρτον δὲι στοιχεῖον ἀγτὶ τοῦ καθηκότος ἀπεγγράψει, ἵνας ἀνάγνωστα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ τὰ γραφόμενα.* 'Moreover on other occasions, whenever he had a secret message to send to anybody, he would always substitute for the proper letter the fourth letter beyond, so that the writing might be illegible to the casual reader.' Sophocles (*Lexicon of Byzantine Greek*, p. 137) acutely remarks: 'the context requires *ἀν-ανάγνωστα*, unless we read *ἀν-ἀγνωστα*'. Bekker and Boissévain boldly emend *ἀνάγνωστα* to *ἀ-γνωστα*, although there is not the slightest necessity for it. E. Cary (*Loeb Classical Library*) follows both masters into the ditch and renders the emended passage: 'so that the writing might be unintelligible'. [This note is the result of a suggestion made to me by Professor G. L. Hendrickson of Yale.]

'Whoever of the gods perjures himself, *lies breathless* for an entire year,—he never gets a taste of ambrosia and nectar—not much!—instead, *he lies without a particle of breath in his body*' Evelyn-White (Loeb Classical Library) sees no difference in force between the prefixes of *νήπτυμος* and *ἀνάπνευστος*, translating the former word 'breathless', and the latter 'spiritless'. For a radically different treatment of the word, see A. Thumb, Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 4th ed., p. 611, note.

2. THE FORMS OF THE NEGATIVE PREFIX IN INDO-GERMANIC.

Theoretically, at least, the Ablaut-forms of the dental nasal prefix which we should be most likely to find in Indo-Germanic may be set down as follows:

ne	no	ṇ
ñē	ñō	ñ̄

I-G *ṇ, Indic *a-an-*, Greek *ἀ-ἄν-*, Latin *in-*, Germanic *un-*, has been discussed in the first two paragraphs of this paper. The occurrences are, of course, innumerable.

I-G *ne, Indic *na*, Greek *νε- in composition, Latin *ne- in composition, occurs with a fair degree of frequency. It is represented in Greek by such words as *νήκουστος*, 'unheard', *νε + ἀκούω; *νήγρετος*, 'not to be awakened', *νε + ἐγέίρω; *νώνυμος*, 'unnamed', *νε + ὄνομα. Formed by analogy of the above (Brugmann, I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 22) are *νήποινος*, 'without punishment', (*ποιή*); *νηκερδῆς*, 'without gain', (*κέρδος*).

I-G *ñē is not represented in Greek. Its only representatives are Vedic *ñā*, Lat. *ñē*.

I-G *no and *ñō are not represented.

I-G *ñ̄ is also not represented, in my opinion. Brugmann (I-G Gr. I. 1², p. 419) assumes the existence of I-G *ñ̄ to explain the prefix of *νήποινος*, *νηκερδῆς*. But later on (I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 22), he explains these forms (correctly, in my opinion) as due to the analogy of *νήκουστος*, *νήγρετος*, κτλ. Brugmann also (I-G Gr. I. 1², p. 419) assumes the existence of I-G *ñ̄ to explain what he considers to be the prefix *āv-* of *ἀμφασίη* (= *ἀφασίη*). The history of the prefix, according to Brugmann, is as follows: I-G *ñ̄- > *āv- > av- (by vowel-

shortening bef. nas. + cons.). On the other hand Kretschmer (Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, 31. 408; quoted by Boisacq, p. 57) considers *āv-* to be the anteconsonantal form corresponding to the antevocalic form *āva-* in *āváednos κτλ.* He is therefore led to postulate the following series of Ablaut-forms in Greek:

ā- (< I-G **ṇ̄-*) : *āv-* : *āva-* : *vā-* (< I-G **ñ̄-*).

With regard to *āphaoī*, it looks suspiciously like the snake *āphaoī* with the frog *āphī* under its skin. With regard to *āváednos*, if the explanation offered in the first two paragraphs of this paper be admitted, there is no necessity for assuming the existence of so extraordinary a series of Ablaut-forms as that postulated by Kretschmer. With regard to I-G **ñ̄*, therefore, there is no evidence that it ever existed as a form of the negative prefix. In view of the foregoing considerations, I venture to express the opinion that the Indo-Germanic primitives of the negative prefixes in Greek are the following two, and only the following two: *ne* and *ṇ̄*.

3. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* IN PĀLI.

(a) *ana-bhāva*, in the expressions *anabhāvam gameti*, *anabhāva-kata* (-*gata*), meaning respectively: 'utterly annihilates', 'utterly annihilated'. For occurrences of the word, see Indices to the *Aṅguttara* and *Saṃyutta Nikāyas*. Cf. *Vinaya Texts ii* (SBE. 17), p. 113, note 4; also Andersen, *Pāli Glossary*, p. 8.

(b) *ana-mata*, *anā-mata*, 'Absolute Deathless', 'absolute immunity from death', epithet of *Nibbāna*. *Jātaka*, vol. ii, p. 56¹⁻¹⁴. The commentator naïvely remarks that inasmuch as *amatām* is employed as a euphemism for *mataṭṭhānam*, the author of the stanza employs *anamatām* to bring out the negative idea. He adds that the reading *anamatām* also occurs. The commentator's explanation is of course purely fanciful. *anāmatām* is by metrical lengthening for *anamatām*, as a glance at the fourth pada shows: *n'atthi loke anāmatām*.

(c) *ana-matagga*, 'having no known or conceivable beginning', 'whose beginning cannot possibly be known or imagined', 'whose beginning is beyond the power of thought to conceive'. It is no exaggeration to say that this is the most

extraordinary and highly significant word in the Pāli language. An exhaustive treatment of this word will be furnished in a subsequent paper entitled Contributions to Pāli Lexicography, Part I.

4. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* (*an-a-*) IN PRĀKRIT.

As observed in the first paragraph of this paper, whereas in Greek and Pāli this prefix is invariably employed as a reinforced, emphatic negative prefix, in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India the force of the prefix has clearly weakened and it is employed as a commonplace negative prefix in no respect differing from the simple prefix *an-* or *a-*. By a familiar phonetic law, Sanskrit and Pāli *an-a-* becomes *an-a-* in the Prākrits and vernaculars, being retained only in Urdū. In the vernaculars, except in Sindhi, *an-a-* is pronounced like *an-*.

[The words in the following list are taken for the most part from R. Pischel's paper in Bezzenger's Beiträge, vol. iii, p. 243 ff., and from the same scholar's Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, § 77, p. 69. The Old Western Rājasthānī words are taken from L. P. Tessitori's paper in the Indian Antiquary for January, 1916, p. 7. Abbreviations: G=Gujarati, M=Mārāthī, OWR=Old Western Rājasthānī, P=Pañjābī, Pkt=Prākrit, S=Sindhi, Skt=Sanskrit, U=Urdū.]

ana-ii, Skt. *anīti*, 'bad policy', 'imprudence'. (Pkt.) *anā-
uvasamkha*, cf. Skt. *upasamkhya*, 'innumerable'. (Pkt.)
ana-khamibho, 'without feathers'. (S.) *ana-ganati*, 'in-
numerable'. (S.) *ana-garītum*, 'not pleasing'. (G.) *ana-
ghāri*, 'houseless'. (OWR.) *ana-cīrtiya*, Skt. *acintita*, Pāli
acintiya, 'inconceivable'. (Pkt.) *ana-cchiāram*, Skt. gloss
acchinnam, 'uncut', 'unbounded'. (Pkt.) *ana-cchunṇa*, 'un-
trodden'. (Pkt.) *ana-jāñ*, 'not knowing'. (P. etc.) *ana-
jāñai*, 'dost not know'. (OWR. Cf. Skt. *a-pacasi* and Greek
ἀ-τίει, Brugmann, I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 106.) *ana-dādhyo*, 'with-
out beard'. (S.) *ana-teđiu*, 'not called'. (OWR.) *ana-
thiano*, 'impossible'. (S.) *ana-didhu*, 'not given'. (OWR.)
ana-dihara, Skt. *adīrgha*, 'not long'. (Pkt.) *ana-dekhā*,
'invisible'. (U.) *ana-parīyā*, *anapadiā*, 'unread'. (P.)
ana-puccho, 'unasked'. (S.) *ana-pharasataü*, 'not touch-
ing'. (OWR.) *ana-mānañem*, 'despising'. (M.) *ana-*

mānu, 'contempt'. (M.) *ana-milia*, 'not having appeared'. (Pkt.) *ana-rasia*, 'not short'. (Pkt.) *ana-rahū*, cf. Skt. *navavadhūḥ*, 'not a newly wedded woman'. (Pkt.) *ana-rāmaa*, Skt. **arāmaka* (=Skt. *arati*), 'displeasure', 'dissatisfaction'. (Pkt.) *ana-rikko*, Skt. gloss *kṣaṇarahitāḥ*, *niravasarah*, 'inopportune'. (Pkt.) *ana-lahivāū*, 'impossible to obtain'. (OWR.) *ana-vayagga*, Pāli *ana-matagga*, 'with no known beginning'. (Pkt. See my Contributions to Pāli Lexicography, Part I, not yet published.) *ana-var*, 'not a husband', i. e., 'a young fellow' (cf. *var*, 'husband'). (G. M.) *ana-vāṭo*, 'pathless'. (S.) *ana-vāṇī*, 'barefoot'. (M.) *ana-vesāhi*, 'unbelief'. (S.) *ana-vesāho*, 'unbelieving'. (S.) *ana-çruta*, 'not heard'. (M.) *ana-sikh*, 'not taught'. (U.) *ana-sunā*, 'not heard'. (U.) *ana-happanayam*, Skt. gloss *anashtam*, 'not destroyed', 'not lost'. (Pkt.) *ana-hiaa*, cf. Skt. *-hṛdaya*, 'unconscious'. (Pkt.) *ana-honta*, *anahurinta*, Skt. *abhavant-*, cf. Pāli *anabhāva*, 'not existing'. (Pkt.) *ana-hit*, 'disadvantage'. (M.)

5. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* IN AVESTAN.

Bartholomae (*Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, col. 119 ff.) lists the following words containing a compound negative prefix *an-a-*: *ana-marəždika-*, 'pitiless'. *ana-saxta-*, 'not having reached'. *ana-zəθa-*, 'unborn'. *ana-šita-*, 'uninhabitable'. *ana-x̌arəθa-*, 'without food'. *ana-x̌āsta-*, 'uncooked'. What is the precise force of this prefix, and what may be its history, I am unable to say.

EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

V.—OMOROKA AND THALATTH.

The Babylonian priest Berossus says in the fragments of his Greek history of Babylonia (*c.* 250 B. C.) that the chief of the primeval monsters was a woman named Ομορωκα, which was in the Chaldean language Θαλατθ, and in Greek: θάλασσα. Then Bel came, cut the woman asunder, and out of one half of her he formed the earth, and of the other half the heavens. All this was an allegorical description of nature. For the Greek text see KAT¹ 488.¹ Instead of Ομορωκα we must read Ομορκα, because Berossus adds that the numerical value of Ομορ[ω]κα was the same as that of σελήνη (κατὰ δὲ ἰσόψηφον σελήνη).² The numerical values of the letters of both Ομορκα and σελήνη are 301, whereas the numerical value of Ομορωκα would be 1101.

The alleged Chaldean (*i. e.* Assyro-Babylonian) word for sea, Θαλατθ, has evidently been assimilated to the Greek θά-

¹ AG²=Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik* (1906).—AJSL=American Journal of Semitic Languages.—AkF=Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter* (1915).—BA=Beiträge zur Assyriologie.—BT=Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*.—CV=Haupt, *Die akkadische Sprache* (1883).—EB¹¹=Encyclopædia Britannica, eleventh edition.—GK=Genesius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*.—JAOS=Journal of the American Oriental Society.—JBL=Journal of Biblical Literature.—JHUC=Johns Hopkins University Circulars.—KAT¹=Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (1903).—OLZ=Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.—PSBA=Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.—SBOT=Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Hebrew*.—SFG=Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (1879).—SG=Delitzsch, *Sumerische Grammatik* (1914).—SGI=Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar* (1914).—ZA=Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.—ZAT=Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.—ZDMG=Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.—ZK=Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung.

²J. H. Wright (ZA 10, 74) thought that the original text of the phrase κατὰ δὲ [τὸ] ἰσόψηφον was perhaps κατὰ δὲ τὸν Φρύγας, according to the Phrygians; but κατὰ δὲ τὸν Φρύγας would never have been corrupted to κατὰ δὲ ἰσόψηφον. The emendation Ομορκα instead of Ομορωκα was suggested by Scaliger in 1606.

λασσα or *θάλαττα*. W. Robertson Smith suggested in 1891 (ZA 6, 339) that ΘΑΛΑΤΘ was a corruption of ΘΑΜΤΕ, i. e. the Assyrian *tâmtu*, sea. In Damascius (c. 530 A. D.) the name of the Babylonian sea-monster, which corresponds to the Old Norse Midgardsorm, the monstrous serpent (*cf.* JBL 36, 95) which lies about the earth in the encircling sea, appears as *Tavθe* (*cf.* KAT² 490) with the second *t*, not the first, aspirated. This is undoubtedly more correct, but even the second *t*, which represents the Semitic feminine ending, would not have been aspirated, unless it had been preceded by a vowel; so Damascius' *Tavθe* should have a second *a* after the *v*. This *Tav[a]θe* (not *Tavθη*, AJSL 34, 210, n. 3) is the Assyrian *tâmâti*, seas, an intensive plural for the great sea, Heb. *jamim* (GK § 124, b. e). Assyr. *tâmâti* was pronounced *tâyâti* (ZA 2, 267; AG² 116). We need not suppose that *Tav[a]θe* represents Assyr. *tâmâtē* (see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 276; *cf.* *Kings*, SBOT, 270, n.*). We must remember that Greek ε tended toward *i*.

Similarly we must read for ΘΑΛΑΤΘ in the received text of Berossus, not ΘΑΜΤΕ, as suggested by W. Robertson Smith, but TAYAΘE, substituting Y for Λ, and shifting the aspiration as in Ionic κιθών for χιτών (AJSL 1, 231, n. 2). Smith's ΘΑΜΤΕ could not represent the Assyrian singular *tâmtu*. This was pronounced, with partial assimilation of the *t* to the preceding *m* (SFG 43, 2; AG² 115) *tâmdu*, and the *m* became a *y*. In some respect Lenormant's ΘAYATΘ was superior to Smith's ΘAMTE.¹ Smith's chief merit in this case is his suggestion to substitute an Ε for the final Θ.

Also *Tηθύς*, the wife of Oceanus, which is supposed to be connected with *τήθη*, grandmother, may represent this Assyrian *tâmâti*, great sea, (*cf.* JHUC, No. 306, p. 34) just as *ἄρυστος* seems to be an adaptation of the Assyrian *apsû* = Sumerian *abzu*, originally *zu-ab* (OLZ 16, 491). According to Damascius, *Απασων* was the husband of *Tav[a]θe*.² Assyr. *tâmâti* was pronounced *tâyâti* or, with elision of the *y* and

¹ Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire*, vol. 1, p. 506 (Paris, 1880).

² *Tiamat* represents salt water, and *Apsû* fresh water (including underground water). The first tablet of the cuneiform Creation series says that the waters of *Apsû* and *Tiamat* mingled. *All the rivers run into the sea* (Eccl. 1, 7).

subsequent contraction, *tā'āti*, *tāti*, which would become in Greek Τῆθι, just as *Pârsa* appears as Πέρσας=Πήρσας=Πάρσας, or *Xšajâršâ* as Ξέρης=Ξήρεης=Ξάρξας; see Haupt, *Purim* (Baltimore, 1906), p. 23, l. 10. For the corruption of Oriental names in Greek cf. Haupt, *Esther* (Chicago, 1908), pp. 11-14 and 68-70 (=AJSL 24, 107-110 and 164-166). Τηθύς, the mother of the Oceanides, is, of course, different from Θέτις, the chief of the Nereids and mother of Achilles, although Latin poets use both *Tethys* and *Thetis* for sea. The *v* in Τηθύς may represent the termination *u* in *tâmâtu* instead of *tâmâti* (see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 267, below). We have *u* for Assyr. *u* in Μύλιττα=Assyr. *mullittu*=*mu'allidtu*, she who assists women in childbirth; cf. *Ειδείθνια*, *Lucina*, and JAOS 16, cvi; KAT³ 423, 7.

As to *Omoroka*, Professor Jastrow suggested that this was probably a corruption of *Marduk*, Merodach. Professor John Henry Wright therefore proposed in 1895 (ZA 10, 71) instead of ἄρχειν δὲ τούτων πάντων γυναικά ὡς ὄνομα Ομορώκα εἴναι the following reading: γυναικά ἣν Βῆλος ἵσχουσεν (or ἵσασεν) φόνομα ὁ Μορδόκα, but this is impossible. Greek and Roman writers, as a rule, simply substitute their own corresponding deities for the names of foreign gods. Herodotus e. g. calls the gods of the ancient Egyptians Zeus, Hermes, Dionysus, Pan, Heracles, Athene, etc. He speaks (1, 199) of the temple of Aphrodite in Babylonia, although he states (1, 131) that the Assyrians call Aphrodite *Mylitta*. For *Ea*, the protector of the Babylonian Noah, Berossus substitutes *Krónos*. The Romans called the chief god of the Teutonic pantheon Mercury; therefore we have Wednesday (*i. e.* Woden's day) for French *Mercredi* (Lat. *dies Mercurii*). The relative clause φόνομα Μορδόκ might stand after an indefinite expression like *ἀνήρ*, but not after a proper name like *Βῆλος*. We would expect *Βῆλος ὁ καλούμενος Μαρδόκ* (cf. 1 Macc. 2, 2) and not ὁ Μορδόκα, with the article, as Wright proposed to read. In Matt. 1, 16 we find Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός, although we have in the following verse ἡς τοῦ Χριστοῦ; cf. also Matt. 2, 4; 16, 16, 20; Acts 5, 42, and E Preuschen's *Handwörterbuch* (Giessen, 1910), cols. 656, below, and 1162.

I believe that Ομορ[ω]κα represents the Sumerian name of *Tiāmat*, sea. It may be the Sumerian *um-engur*, mother of

the deep (cf. SG1 52, 35). Lenormant and Gunkel regarded the name as Semitic, explaining it as *Umm-Uruk*, mother of Erech, or *Umm-árqâ*, mother of the earth, respectively (KAT¹ 492, 2). But *árqâ*, earth (Jer. 10, 11) is Aramaic, not Assyrian; the Assyrian word for *earth* is *erçitu*. Assyr. *Tiāmat*, sea (AkF 44) is derived from the stem *hûm*, to roar.

On the Græco-cuneiform tablets, which I discussed in my paper on Babylonian words in Greek, printed in the *Actes* of the last Oriental Congress held at Athens in 1912, Sumerian *u* is rendered by *o* and *ω*, e. g. δομ for Sumer. *dum*, child, and βωρ for *bûr*, vessel, which appears in Hebrew as *pûrâ*, vat (plural *pûrōt*) and *pûr* (plural *pûrim*) urn (AJSL 24, 127; AkF 33). Here we must remember again that Greek *o* tended toward *u*; the contraction of *o-o* is *ov*. We find *ω* for *û* also in νωρ σανη=Assyr. *nûr šamê*, light of heaven. In a gloss of Hesychius this word is miswritten *σανη* instead of *σανη* (CV 28). In other transliterations on the Græco-cuneiform tablets the *m* is preserved, but this may be merely historical spelling. We find e. g. for Sumer. *gišimmar*, palm: γισιμαρ, also the later (OLZ 17, 455; ZDMG 69, 565) form γιστυαρ. Sumer. *mun-bal*, he dug, is transliterated μονοβαλ; *dum*, child: δομ; Assyr. *mitirtu*, watering: μιτερθ; Assyr. *emuq šamê*, depth of heaven: ημυκ σανη.

These tablets, which seem to have been written c. B. C. 100, also prove the correctness of my theories that at the end of a syllable voiced consonants became unvoiced in Sumerian as in German (JAOS 37, 322, n. 10) and postvocalic *b*, *g*, *d*; *p*, *k*, *t*, were sounded as the corresponding spirants, both in Sumerian and in Assyrian (CV 29, 7; ZK 2, 282, 1; ZA 2, 263; JHUC, No. 59, p. 117; contrast SG 17; AG² 114): e. g. Sumer. *sig*, small (SG1 241, iv) is transliterated σεκ, and *šid*, trench (SG1 260): σεθ; the *u* was, of course, pronounced i at that time, and *θ*, *φ*, *χ*, not as aspirates, but as spirants; therefore Assyr. *iku*, ditch, is transliterated εχχ,¹ and *atappi*, canal : αθαφε; *ēpuš*, he made: ιφος; *Bēlit*, Beltis: Βελεθ; Sumer. *lipiš*, heart (SG1 171):² λεφε.⁴

¹This shows that the *k* is not a *q* (SG1 72; AkF 44): *iku* stands for *hikiu*; cf. Arab. *hákka*, to engrave, scratch.

²Syr. *táppâ*; cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* § 32.

³*Li-piš* means literally *šaman-libbi*; cf. *hel[b lib]bámo*, Ps. 17, 10.

⁴It is true, we find also θαλ=Assyr. *tâlu*, φαλαγ= *palgu*, ισφ . . . =

The *x* must have resembled the German *ich-laut* (Sievers, *Phonetik*⁵ § 341) rather than the *ach-laut*, because for the *ach-laut* (Scotch *ch*) a special sign is used: Ā, and in the transliteration of Assyr. *ixri*, he dug, this symbol is used for both *x* and *r*: ĀĀĒI.¹ In another line, however, it is written ĀĀPEI with *p*. Brücke (BA 1, 257) believed that the Semitic *x* was a combination of the *ach-laut* and a uvular *r*; he therefore used the symbol [x*ξ], ξ being Brücke's symbol for uvular *r*. In modern Greek *x* has the *ich-laut* before *e*, *i*, and *y*, e. g. *χύπα*, widow, is pronounced *chîra*, as a German would pronounce the first two syllables of *Chiragra*, but *χάρις*, grace, *xáris*.

Some may be inclined to think that, if the *x* had been the *ach-laut*, it would not have been necessary to invent a new sign, because the Phenician (contrast AJSL 27, 48) alphabet had a sign for the *ach-laut*; but this argument is not valid: at the time of the adoption of the Phenician alphabet the sound represented by *x* was neither the *ich-laut* nor the *ach-laut*, but a real aspirate *kh* (BA 1, 259, n. 24). This was expressed by KH (cf. EB¹¹ 1, 726; 12, 499). Similarly we find in the cuneiform text of the Amarna tablets Assyrian *x* for Hebrew *h*, e. g. *xarri* for Heb. *har*, mountain; *xirbē* for Heb. *hārbī*,² he absconded=Assyr. *innibit*, he fled; *xurru* for Heb. *çohr*, back=Assyr. *çēru*. Afterwards the sign for the Semitic *x* was used for *η*, just as 'Ain was used for *o*; see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 284; cf. Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, vol. 2, p. 41.

We have this *ich-laut* also in French and in English. The *i* in French *pied*, *Pierre*, and the second *i* in *pitié* are really pronounced as the German *j* partially assimilated to the preceding *p* or *t*. We also hear it, according to Bell, in English word like *pure*, *pew*, *pewter*, or *hue*, *huge*, *human*. In due,

¹ *ispuk*, φα=Sumer. *pa*, canal. The use in Old Babylonian texts of the sign *pi* for *gi* (γα) suggests that *p* was pronounced *f*; cf. ZA 2, 207; JAOS 37, 252; AG⁸ § 24; Meissner, *Assyr. Gr.* § 8, c. See also ZAT 4, 63; 6, 220; contrast ZDMG 68, 267, n. 1.

² Photographic reproductions of these Græco-cuneiform fragments, with valuable comments by Pinches and Sayce, are published in PSBA 24, 108-125 (March 12, 1902).

³ Cf. *nahbēta librōh*, Gen. 31, 27, and the Talmudic *hārbī 'aqmō bē-bēt hak-kissē*, Taan. 23^b (BT 3, 494). See also GK § 53, e; Kings (SBOT) 174, 30.

duty, on the other hand, or French *vieux*, we have the corresponding voiced palatal spirant, i. e. the German *j* in *ja*, *Jahr*, etc. Cf. Viëtor, *Elemente der Phonetik* (1914), p. 117; *Kleine Phonetik* (1913), § 81; Jespersen, *Elementarbuch der Phonetik* (1912), pp. 42, 102.

In his note published in ZA (1895) J. H. Wright stated that he would publish a detailed justification of his emendation of the passage of Berossus in this JOURNAL. So far as I know, this justification has never been published, and it was perhaps better that it was not printed.

PAUL HAUPT.

VI.—CICERO, AD ATT. XV, 9, 1.

When a few months after Caesar's death, Cicero heard that Antony intended to dispose of Brutus and Cassius by sending them upon a mission to buy grain, he expressed himself thus (Ad Att. XV, 9, 1) : O rem miseram! primum ullam ab istis, dein, si aliquam, hanc *legatoriam* provinciam! Atque haud scio an melius sit quam ad Eurotam sedere, . . Ait autem eodem tempore decretum iri ut et iis et reliquis praetoriis provinciae decernantur. Hoc certe melius quam illa Περσικὴ porticus. *Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquο† quom Lanuvium existimavit†*. It seems that Cicero would have Brutus doing something worth while rather than wasting his time at his villa near Lanuvium—the stream and portico of which he had presumably called by Spartan names.

No satisfactory emendation for the end of this passage has been found, and though most editors have offered conjectures, none has dared to print his own proposal in the text. The one that has met with most favor perhaps is that of Gronovius: *Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquietrem Lanuvio existimaris*, ‘when I speak of the Eurotas and the Persian porch I intend you to think of a Sparta no farther away than Lanuvium’. Cicero thus is supposed to be explaining to Atticus in cumbersome Latin his references to Eurotas and Persica, although Atticus was visiting Brutus at Lanuvium during these days even more than Cicero, and apparently knew the place very well (Ad Att. XIV, 21; XV, 4, 2; XV, 9, 2; XV, 20, 2). This obviously is not the solution. The clews to an emendation seem to me to be as follows: 1) Cicero really did not wish Brutus to go away since he wished him to stay near Rome to watch Antony (Ad Att. XV, 11, 1: neque nunc neque ex praetura—ires); 2) there is a word-play in the passage, for Cicero adds immediately: rides, inquires, in talibus rebus? 3) the word-play probably begins with the expression *legatoriam provinciam*: *legatoriam* is so unusual that most editors question it, while *provinciam* does not again occur in the sub-

sequent references to this office. Cicero speaks of it as *curatio frumenti* in XV, 11, 1 and 2, also as *frumentum* in XV, 11, and as *frumentaria res* in XV, 12.

Now if we recall the passage of Euripides' Telephus—*Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, κείνην κόσμει*—to which Cicero has already alluded twice in his letters (Ad Att. I. 20, 3 and IV. 6, 2), and in which a man's "province", that is, his one supreme duty, is called his "Sparta", we may have the explanation of Cicero's play upon *provincia*—*Lacedaemonem* here. The sense is probably this: "I am not sure that this petty office is not better than sitting in his villa at Lanuvium, but I really do not wish him to go anywhere: I do not wish him to think his 'Sparta'—his real duty—elsewhere than right here." Perhaps Cicero would even imply that it was Brutus' "province" to strike down Antony (a few days later he said: *quemquam praeterea oportuisse tangi*, XV, 11, 2) as he had struck Caesar on the Ides. The Latin would be as near the reading of M as any emendation as yet offered: *Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquorem Lanuvio eum existimare*, that is, he need not go away to find his one supreme task.¹

TENNEY FRANK.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

¹ It is tempting to seek a play upon several of the words of the original proverb since the transliteration of Greek words presents one of the chief causes of confusion in Cicero's letter. The original therefore may have been: *Nolo enim eum Lacedaemonem λαξεῖρ* quom *κοσμεῖ* Lanuvium existimare—"I do not wish him to think that he has found his 'Sparta' when he is adorning his villa." This with its word-play on *κοσμεῖ* would perhaps justify *rides*.

VII.—LITHUANIAN *gaudonė* ‘HORSE-FLY’.

Lith. *gaudonė* ‘horse-fly, tabanid, *Gastrophilus equi*’ has heretofore been connected with *gaudžù, gaūsti*, which Kurschat¹ translates: “‘sausen’, mit vorwaltendem *au*-Laut, z. B. ‘weinen, jammern’; auch ‘heulen’ von den Hunden, Wölfen; von dem ‘Summen’ der Bienen, Mücken, doch nur wo es aus der Ferne als ein Massensummen gehört wird”. Philologists, then, have regarded *gaudonė* as meaning etymologically “the buzzer, the hummer”. Thus Leskien, Die Bildung der Nomina im Litauischen (Abhandlungen der philol.-hist. Kl. der Kgl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., Bd. XII), p. 392: “*gaudonė* (Summerin) Pferdebremse: *gaudžù, gaūsti summen*”. Similarly: Leskien, Der Ablaut der Wurzelsilben im Litauischen (Abhandlungen above, Bd. IX), p. 298; Berneker, Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, s. v. *gqdq*; Zubaty, BB. XVIII 262.

But the horse-fly does not buzz or hum; it is perfectly silent. On the other hand, its most obvious characteristic is that of striking, seizing, catching hold. I therefore propose *gaudonė* ‘horse-fly’: *gáduau, gáudyti* ‘to seize, to catch’, iterative to *gáunu, gáuti* ‘to receive, obtain, take’. Cf. *árklj gáudyti* (Kurschat 116) “ein Pferd zu fangen bemüht sein”; *užgáudyti* (Nesselmann 243) “etwas antreffen, darauf stossen, rauben, Beute machen”; *nū bítés užgáutas* (Nesselmann 243; pret. pass. part. to *užgáunu*) “von einer Biene gestochen”.

Primary nouns of agency similar in formation to *gaudonė* are *valdōnas* ‘ruler’: *valdaū, valdyti* ‘to rule’; *dryköné* ‘a tall woman’: *drykstù, drýkti* ‘to hang far down’ (of a thread or a stalk of grain), etc. Cf. Leskien, Nomina, 392; Sommer, Die indogermanischen *iā*- und *io*-Stämme im Baltischen, 170, 180.

Notice further Nesselmann 245: “*Gaudóne* ‘eine Premse, die den Pferden an das Ohr oder an die Oberlippe angelegt wird, um sie zu bändigen’”. Certainly there is no buzzing

¹ Kurschat prints the word without brackets, thus indicating that it was thoroughly familiar to him.

here, but quite as certainly there is a taking hold of a horse. There is no doubt that Nesselmann's word is identical with Kurschat's, but his definition is probably secondary. The transfer of meaning may have been due to semantic influence from the German—*Bremse*, *Pferdebremse* 'horse-fly': *Bremse* 'a twitch put on the mouths of horses to control them while they are being shod'. That the German word had made an impression, at least upon Prussian Lithuanian, is proved by Kurschat (Deutsch-lit. Wb., 259): "Bremse, die, 'ein Werkzeug zum Drücken, Klemmen', *bremgas*".

If my derivation of the word should prove acceptable, *gaudonė* would desert the IE. group which has adopted it (Lith. *gaudžù*: Skr. *ghóṣa* 'noise, cry'; Goth. *gaunōn* 'lament, wail'; OIcel. *gauta* 'to babble, chatter') and return to Lith. *gáunu*: Avest. *gúnaoiti* 'procures, provides'; Gk. *γύαλον* 'curvature, cavity, dale'; Lat. *vola* 'hollow of the hand'. Cf. *gaudžù* and *gáunu* in my forthcoming Lithuanian Etymological Index.

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Linguistic Change: an introduction to the historical study of language. By E. H. STURTEVANT, Assistant Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 1917. Pp. ix + 185.

"This little book, which has grown out of lectures to students beginning their scientific study of language, is primarily intended as a textbook for similar introductory courses. It is hoped, however, that it will appeal to a wider public, and consequently technical terms and symbols that are not familiar to all educated people have been eliminated as far as possible." In these words, which begin the preface, Professor Sturtevant very aptly characterizes his volume. The separate chapters bear the headings: Introduction on the Nature of Language, Primary Change of Form, Secondary Change of Form, Change of Meaning, Change in Vocabulary, Change in Syntax, Language and Dialect, The Trend of Linguistic Development.

Now, with the book as a whole, the reviewer is in such thorough agreement that it seems to him hardly suitable here to use space in developing those views which Professor Sturtevant has set forth with clarity and force, and with examples drawn from his own experience and from that of others, not with the hackneyed illustrations familiar to the reader of philological treatises; but there are a few subsidiary points on which the reviewer feels doubt or holds divergent opinions, and to these he would devote himself.

On pages 6 and 8, we find the statement that in early times the Greek alphabet did not take account of the important difference between short and long vowels, and that even in its more developed form it did not distinguish them in all instances. As a matter of fact, the Greek alphabet paid no attention to matters of *quantity*; it was differences of *quality* only which it attempted to indicate. Incidentally, these differences of quality were in most instances combined with differences of quantity; and this has misled scholars into thinking that the Greeks took pains to distinguish short and long vowels by using different letters in writing—except for *a i u*. The truth is that *a i u* had the same quality whether long or short, and hence there was no call to differentiate them in writing; whereas long *e* and *o* were open, and short *e* and *o* were close, so that in the Ionic alphabet

η and ω , ϵ and \circ were used respectively. But at the same time, E represented both short ϵ and long ϵ —the latter being the so-called spurious diphthong $\epsilon\alpha$, arising from lengthened ϵ and by contraction of $\epsilon\alpha$. Similarly, O represented \circ and spurious $\circ\omega$. At Athens, matters were even worse: E represented ϵ , η , and spurious $\epsilon\alpha$; O stood for \circ , ω , and spurious $\circ\omega$. When the Ionic alphabet was introduced at Athens, E and O still had two values, and EI and OY were not written for the spurious diphthongs until after these sounds had become identical with the true diphthongs. The peculiar writings of the vowels in some of the Cyclades, and those of "strict" Doric, furnish evidence in the same direction; so does the confusion in spelling of post-classical Greek. So far from finding variations of quantity indicated by the use of different letters, the reviewer is not aware of any Indo-European language which in its writing differentiates longs and shorts of the same quality other than by diacritical marks, or by doubling the letter, or by adding a silent consonant.

On pages 11 and 137, and elsewhere, the mooted problem of the speech-unit comes up, and decision is pronounced in favor of the sentence in that capacity. Professor Sturtevant admits that there are other speech-units, and regards the phrase and the syllable as those of next importance after the sentence, while the word as a unit is of very little consequence. This view, while now much upheld, the reviewer regards as untenable (as does also Prof. A. J. Carnoy in his forthcoming article, *The Predicating Sentence*, TAPA. xlviii). The sentence, the phrase, and the syllable are *phonetic* units, it is true, because pauses may be made by the speaker at the close of any one of them; but the word is the *speech*-unit, because the word is the unit which is shifted from place to place, from phrase to phrase, from sentence to sentence, ever taking its place in the sentence-complex which is built up to express the thought. The phrase is the complex unit, and the sentence is a phrase or a complex of phrases. The whole matter is reducible to this: a child, just beginning to speak, uses single words, not syllables, nor phrases, nor sentences; phrases and sentences are later constructions, and syllables are obscurities whose separate entities are revealed later by conscious study under instruction. These first words are not necessarily monosyllabic like the "Damn!" of the infantile hero of a recent work of fiction, but may even be of five times that length, if family tradition be correct in alleging that the reviewer's first articulate utterance was "hippopotamus." But in developed speech, the phrase and the sentence become phonetic units of great importance, as Professor Sturtevant says; and yet they are always complex unities, since pauses may be made anywhere in them after a word, or even after a syllable: witness the recent nerve-racking habit

of speakers in making a long pause for emphasis after the conjunction *but*, and the inter-syllabic pauses—"nine-ah-teen"—of a certain much beloved and lamented American Hellenist. And therefore the reviewer persists in maintaining that the word is *the* speech-unit.

As for differences of quantity of syllables (page 20), it is quite true that there may be an indefinite number of degrees of length; but no language will subject itself to an over-elaborate scheme, and syllables fall easily into a grouping of long and short, as the chief classification. Where a long is substituted for an unaccented short—as in Greek and Latin, in some meters, cited by Professor Sturtevant—it may be that we may draw a parallel from English verse, and support a stress-accent in the poetry of the classical languages: even in English we feel verse to be improved by the avoidance of heavy syllables in unaccented positions, but we do not proscribe their use.

And now for a series of short items. Page 22: even the avoidance of technical terminology hardly justifies the failure to use the term "vowel liquids and nasals," or the like, when the topic is to be discussed; in this instance, the lack of the term, or of a statement that *r l m n* may be vowels and not consonants, has made the subject much more difficult to the non-technicist. Page 36: as a complement to the French spelling of *Schiller* with *G*, the reviewer has heard a German pronounce the French name *Sauvage* as though *Saufache*; German lacks the voiced French *g*, it is true, but has the voiced *v*. Page 38: in the hybrid *evoid* by contamination of *evade* and *avoid*, the *d* also is a factor, as well as the *v*. Page 45: we should expect the numeral *four* to appear in English and in German with initial *w-* (cf. Eng. *what*, Germ. *was*, Lat. *quod*; Latin *quattuor*), not with initial *h-*, as Professor Sturtevant states; *hw-* would be the initial in Anglo-Saxon and in Old High German, but not in the more recent stages of the languages. Page 49: it is regrettable that the Latin words have not the sign of length over the long vowels; particularly is this true when it seems to lead to the derivation of nominative *Pollux* from Πολυδέκης, through the intermediate stages *Polduces* and *Polluces*. Now these forms do all occur, if we accept an Etruscan spelling, slightly different, as representing *Polduces*. But we should write *Poldūces* *Pollūces* *Pollūx*; and then the impossibility of syncopating a long vowel would make it clear that Latin *Pollūx* comes in reality from the vocative Πολύδεκες, with a short vowel in the ultima. Page 50: in *alacer elementum* etc., it might be well to explain that the assimilation of the vowel in the second syllable to that of the first is not a change, but a *prevention* of a change; assimilation may be either a change toward likeness, or, as here, prevention of a change toward unlikeness. Page 54: would **sociās* for

**socītās* for *societās* be a linguistic monstrosity, as Professor Sturtevant thinks? Even if one regard *finitis* from **finites* as a product of an analogy, there remains *tibicen*, presumably from **tibie-* from **tibio-*, with analogical final stem-vowel. The reviewer considers *societās* and the like as new formations in this respect. As for *aliter* (page 115, n.), this cannot rest on **ali-iter* with dissimilative loss, since the neuter of *alius* is *aliud*, and we should have *aliud iter*, not **ali(um) iter* to work with. It can be derived analogically by means of the archaic nominative *alis*, thus: *fortis: forti-ter=alis: ali-ter*.

There are a few, a very few, lapses or misprints, such as *cordem* (page 69), despite the neuter gender of *cor*; *höid* instead of *höit* as the New York pronunciation of *hurt* (page 71); *θūpa* for *θvūpōs* (page 73); Latin *mille* is not regularly an adjective in the singular (page 132), but in older Latin is regularly a substantive, and in classical and silver Latin is frequently so (TAPA. xlvi. 74-77).

The introduction of *o* from the past participle into the preterit indicative in English verbs is, it is true, analogical (page 100); but verbs with the same vowel in the two forms, that cause the analogical change, themselves start with forms of the preterit plural containing the same vowel as the participle, and this factor deserves mention. Again, it is hardly fair to say (page 118-119) that the variation of vowels in English *drive* and *drove* "was not originally significant." However the *o* ablaut grades originated, the use of them came to be a definite factor in the formation of the Indo-European perfect indicative singular, and has this significance, unless the word "originally" is used by Professor Sturtevant as of a period antedating the perfect formation. In the phrase *Dis Manibus*, we are told (page 121), there is probably a trace of the adjectival use of *deus*, a use which otherwise is restricted in Latin to its phonetic twin *divus*; yet *dis* is in reality a form phonetically correct for both *deus* and *divus*.

"Etymology is a valuable study, but we should not expect it to help us very much in understanding our mother-tongue" (page 98). Is this true? Perhaps it might be for the speakers of a language which was, like the slave among the Romans, *nullis maioribus*; but when the earlier stages of the tongue in question are matters of record, as with English, French, German—to list no others—etymology is of great assistance. And when a speech is a hybrid, like English, etymology is of utmost importance in helping toward an accurate appreciation of the true meanings of the imported element. How often English writers and speakers use terms inappropriately for lack of knowledge of the basic significance: *lurid* as though meaning *brilliant*, *desiccated* as though *shredded*, *cupidity* as though *complicity*! The present-day signification must not, of course,

be crowded out of mind by that which the word had originally ; yet many a time it is just the writer's feeling for the ancient values of words, surviving as a faint connotation in modern speech, that makes the difference between a slovenly style and a *κτήμα τε δέι*.

Again, the reviewer can only in part agree with Professor Sturtevant when (pages 165-166) he disputes John Stuart Mill's laudation of Greek and Latin as superior languages because they have a regular and complicated structure. An analytical language, like English, expresses normally but one or at most two functions by one and the same word in any given sentence, and employs position to a great extent to convey syntactical relations ; but a language which is inflective or synthetic may express several relations by one and the same form of a word, and may then employ position to convey the varying degrees of emphasis. How hard it is, by the printed page, to convey the exact shade of meaning of *Hanc habeo sententiam*: on the printed page the spoken emphasis disappears, and we must take refuge in italics or in grammatical paraphrases, or in a combination : " *This* is the opinion which I have." An inflective language has therefore certain elements of economy not shared by an analytical language. Latin, it is true, suffers from the want of articles and from a relative paucity of prepositions ; but Greek suffers under neither of these disadvantages. Obviously no language has all the advantages and none of the defects ; but there may be a greater profit to the speaker of an analytic tongue in the study of an inflective language, than in the reverse process (despite Sturtevant, page 166, ftn.), since the speaker of the former, in speaking, performs the analysis of his thought in an instinctive and sub-conscious manner, and is hence unable to employ the process of analysis consciously and at will. When he studies an inflective language, he must consider what various relations are conveyed in one and the same word, and must consciously deal with them in transferring those ideas from the foreign tongue into his own mother speech, or in making them his own intellectual possession. On the other hand, the speaker of an inflective language will find it easy to understand an analytic language, for in many instances a whole word complex falls into place in his own language in a single word, without any effort on his part. To take an example : the perfective and imperfective verbs of Russian offer no difficulty for translation from Russian into English, because English employs one and the same word to convey both ideas ; but there is a very serious difficulty in translating into Russian. It is therefore more illuminating for a Russian to study English than for an Englishman to study Russian, since by this study the Russian becomes aware of the nature of discriminations which he must in every

sentence be making, and which he makes instinctively and unreflectively; but the Englishman merely rejoices that his own language is free from this quite unnecessary subtlety. Again, the Latin future expresses temporal future and the determined future; English distinguishes between them by a nice use of auxiliaries. The study of Latin is in this point a valuable aid in clarifying thought, since the distinction between the two kinds of futures must be made consciously in order to express the thought in English, or—not to confine the mental operation to translation, which is a means, and not a goal—for an English-speaking person to grasp the idea in its exact significance; but the Roman would find no such difficulty, and consequently no such stimulus to thought, in the appreciation of English *will* and *shall*.

But finally, in view of some differences of opinion, the reviewer recalls the words of Pliny the Younger, who, sending the Panegyric upon Trajan to his friend Voconius, urged him to criticize freely, “*ita enim magis credam cetera tibi placere, si quaedam displicuisse cognovero.*” And it is in this spirit that the present review has been written. The book as a whole is so sane, so sensible, so scholarly, so lucid and so interesting even to the non-technical reader, that one can regret only that the publishers had not requested that its length be doubled, and the themes treated with less brevity and compactness.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Den Oldjavanske Wirātaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original.
Bidrag til Mahābhārata-forskningen. Af K. Wulff.
København, 1917.

The medieval literature of the island of Java is written in a peculiar artificial dialect called Kavi (tho it is not, as Weber supposed and as the name seems to suggest, exclusively poetic). A very large part of the vocabulary is plain and undisguised Sanskrit—unless the dropping of all inflectional endings be called a disguise. It is not, be it noted, in any way Prakritic. Along with the language, Indian literature, religion, mythology, art, and general culture were introduced to Java, where they soon strongly dominated the native elements.

The Kavi literature is now preserved almost exclusively on the neighboring island of Bali. Mohammedan zeal has nearly extinguished it in Java.

Many versions of important works of Indian literature are known to exist in this Kavi language. For Indologists, doubtless the most important of them is a literal prose translation of the Mahābhārata, which must once have reproduced completely

and quite exactly a Sanskrit version thereof that was in existence in the tenth century A. D. (when several of the extant books of the Kavi version date themselves; the dates are precise and seemingly not open to suspicion). The oral learned tradition of Bali furnishes the names of all of the 18 books thereof—which names correspond in the main to those of the present-day Sanskrit Mbh. (tho with some puzzling divergences). According to this same oral tradition, all but eight of these books are lost. These eight are known in manuscript; but also, curiously, a manuscript has recently been discovered of one of the ten books alleged to be lost.

Five of these books—Adi, Virāta, Asramavāsika, Māusala, and Mahāprasthānika—have been edited at various times by the Dutch scholar Juynboll. The Dutch have, in fact, had a practical monopoly of work in Kavi literature. The fact that they have written almost exclusively in their own language has doubtless kept their valuable labors from attaining the prominence they deserve. Those who are ignorant of Dutch may, however, refer to JRAS. 1913, page 1 ff., where van Hinloopen Labberton has mercifully publisht in English some brief notes bearing on the present subject. Weber's article in Ind. Stud. 2, page 124 ff. (year 1853), is still the most elaborate study on Kavi now existing in an "international" language; it is for that reason still important, tho seriously antiquated and unreliable in various respects.

The book now under review is the first attempt at a thoroughgoing study of the relations between a book of the Javanese Mbh. and the Sanskrit versions thereof. The author modestly calls it merely a preliminary work and a collection of materials—not a complete collection, either, but rather an introduction thereto, with a selection of some especially interesting materials. A large part of the book comprises a detailed study of the Sanskrit verses or fragments of verses which are sprinkled thruout the entire text—each one generally followed by a paraphrase in Kavi. This is a most curious phenomenon, which is well illustrated by the passage quoted *in extenso* by van Hinloopen Labberton, l. c. It is demonstrable that the quotations were all, or practically all, taken directly from the original text, the source for the translation; but the motive of the selection of them has not been discovered. Wulff rightly finds unsatisfactory all the explanations that have been attempted. Nearly all the quotations are found (usually with more or less variants) in some of the Sanskrit versions now known, and Wulff carefully collates and evaluates the readings of the Calcutta edition, of the South Indian text publisht at Bombay in 1906, and of a Bengal version found in a Copenhagen MS., in comparison with the Javanese readings.

Besides this the present work contains general introductory material, a discussion of the divisions of the work in the several known versions, and a detailed study of selected passages of particular interest. The author promises later to publish the materials for a systematic comparative study of the entire *Virāṭaparva*.

Wulff believes, and shows good grounds for believing, that from the Javanese *Mbh.*, as far as it is preserved, can be got a pretty good and accurate picture of its original—that is, of a Sanskrit version that existed in the 10th century A. D. If this is true, as it seems to be, then the importance of the work is evident. Hardly any Indian MSS. of the *Mbh.* are over 200 years old; and no Sanskrit version, in its present form, can be guaranteed any such antiquity as 1000 A. D.

Wulff's aim is, then, to submit the materials for judging of the probable aspect of that tenth-century *Mbh.*, as compared with known Sanskrit versions. His results, as he emphasizes, are only tentative, and are only partly available in the present volume. And in so far as his conclusions can be summarized at all as yet, they are mostly hard to state in a few words. He thinks it likely that the original of the Javanese stood rather by itself genetically—that is, it was related to both the Northern and Southern Sanskrit texts (so far as known to him) less closely than are those texts related to each other. Superficially, it resembles the Northern text much more than the Southern; but there is reason to believe that this is due to late and secondary changes in the latter; and some important evidence points to a rather closer connexion with the Southern text than with the Northern. The *Harivansā* apparently was not attached to the Sanskrit version that came to Java in the tenth century A. D. (page 27), which is interesting in view of Bühler's well-known thesis that the *Mbh.* must have been complete in substantially its present proportions, including the *Harivansā*, in 532/3 A. D.

The reviewer is imprest, on the one hand, with the thorough and painstaking way in which Wulff has obviously done his work, and, on the other hand, with the caution and conservatism which temper his lucid and skillful presentation. Caution and conservatism are only too frequently missing in such comparative studies of versions of a work. Wulff's work is no mere tabulation, tho his modesty sometimes suggests that. It is not lacking in keen insight. It is strikingly lacking in bold generalizations and cocksure pronouncements. The few generalizations which are made, like those quoted above, are set forth with cautious qualifications, and after most careful presentation of evidence pro and con.

These characteristics and the importance of the subject make the book one that can be heartily commended to all who are

interested in the history of the Mbh. (N. B. not its pre-history or genesis; except as to the Harivansá, it presents no reason to question Bühler's above-mentioned thesis). I trust that fear of the Danish language (the learning of which is an amazingly slight task for anyone well acquainted with German and English) will not deter any such persons from making its acquaintance. Yet it does, after all, seem a curious fatality that a second "minor" language (no offense intended) should be added to Dutch as a necessary equipment for those who would familiarize themselves with this field!

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

L. CLÉDAT, *Manuel de Phonétique et de Morphologie Historique du Français*. Paris, Hachette, 1917. Pp. vi + 282.

The well-known professor of the University of Lyons, M. Léon Clédat, has set forth in this brief compendium of French historical grammar the standard views of the subject. He has modified them here and there in accordance with his own views, familiar to scholars from articles in his *Revue de philologie française et de littérature*.

The most original feature of the book is the extended discussion of the treatment of final consonants in modern French, whether in *liaison* or not. Here we find a number of new suggestions, and, as in all the works of M. Clédat, many valuable remarks upon current usage. We learn, for instance (p. 157), that the *s* of *os* in the plural, which tends more and more to be pronounced, is still uniformly mute in familiar phrases such as 'il ne fera pas de vieux ô,' 'être trempé jusqu'aux ô.' As the writings just cited may be taken to indicate, there are abundant evidences that M. Clédat is a spelling reformer.

Another novel trait of the work appears in certain departures from usual practice in the organization of the phonology, such as taking up atomic vowels before others. The general plan of this part of the work, however, does not differ markedly from that of Nyrop's *Grammaire historique de la langue française*. This section of the book suffers from somewhat excessive condensation. As a result, an elementary student would be likely to find some of the statements made obscure and even misleading. Thus on p. 57 we have *quinquanta* as the radical of *cinquante*, while on p. 88 the author gives the correct explanation that the French word comes from a dissimilated form in *cinq*—. Again, we are told on p. 16 that the accented vowel of a Latin monosyllable is always treated as though it were free,

i. e., in an open syllable. It is not until we reach p. 37 and p. 133, respectively, that we learn that M. Clédat considers—rather questionably—that *jam* and (*il*) *lac* were proclitics and hence treated otherwise. On p. 61 it is stated that a following nasal vowel prevents free tonic *o* from changing to *eu*, and *bone*<*bona* is cited as an example. Nothing whatever is said of the existence of *buene* in Old French!

Aside from these defects due to brevity of statement, occasional explanations are given which need revision. Thus the comparison of other Romance languages makes it fairly certain that French *hus* comes from * *ustium*, not from * *ostium*. It is improbable that the feminine plurals *les* and *mes*, instead of * *las* and * *mas*, are to be accounted for by the analogical influence of *cez*, *ces* (p. 20). * *Las* and * *mas* are found nowhere in French, while M. Clédat himself notes (pp. 7–8), that *cez*, *ces* are derived “ultérieurement” from *cestes*, a form which exists. Again, Orelli's and Scheler's etymon *sub longum* for *selonc* should not be mentioned (p. 135) to the exclusion of *secundum*, the much more probable base. The name *ye* for “*i grec*” or rather “*yod*” is a somewhat unfortunate neologism, especially as it is used as early as p. 9 and is not explained until we reach p. 71, n. 1! Our students have enough real difficulties to struggle with; let us spare them unnecessary innovations in terminology!

The morphology is planned on broader lines than the phonology. It contains fewer details, and is consequently more readable. Here again there are a number of interesting examples from modern popular usage, such as *elle se décolte* (= *décollète*) [p. 219, n. ; cf. Martinon, Comment on prononce le français, p. 174, n.] and *viendre* (= *venir*) [p. 207].

Despite the defects we have noted, M. Clédat's book will be of service for the pedagogical purposes for which it was intended. Scholars who read it will also glean valuable bits of information from its unpretentious pages.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

HERMES XLIX, No. 2.

Die römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit (161-195). Fr. Leo intended this account of Roman poetry to serve as the first chapter of the second volume of his history of Roman literature. It is the only one of his unpublished writings found to be nearly complete. Beginning with a brief characterization of the period, he gives an account of Sulla and his literary work, particularly the egotistic memoirs. Thereupon he takes up the decadence of the dramatic literature, and gives a condensed, but illuminating account of the literary Atellana, of which Pomponius and Novius were the chief exponents. Then we learn of Laevius and his poems in manifold meters, who calls his critics 'subductisupercilicarptores'; of Sueius' Moretum, etc. (cf. Rh. M. XXXVII, p. 342), and of Gnaeus Matius' Mimiambi. The chapter closes with Cicero's metrical compositions, especially his translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. The fascicle opens with an obituary notice of Leo.

Hortensius und Cicero bei historischen Studien (196-213). F. Münzer publishes this study of the *Annales* of Q. Hortensius, in advance of a delayed, larger investigation, in order to redeem his pledge to F. Vonder Mühl (cf. Pauly-Wis. R. E. VIII 2481, 8). In consequence of the agreement between Lucullus, Hortensius and Sisenna (cf. Plut. Luc. 1, 5; Wölfflin, A. J. P. XV 393), the writing of a poem on the Social war fell to the lot of Hortensius (cf. Schanz, Gesch. d. röm. Lit. 1, 2³, 210). Considering the circumstances and other scanty evidence M. concludes that it had no historical value, although on account of personal mention it was preserved in the family archives of the noted Magii (cf. Livy XXIII, 7, 4-10, 13; Sil. It. XI 157-258, 377-384); where it was seen by Velleius, a member of the family. Catullus 95 has a fling at this youthful performance of Hortensius. The citations of Hortensius as an historical authority by Cicero, are merely references to verbal communications.

Zur Textkritik der Dionysiaka des Nonnus (214-228). H. Tiedke shows that the MS tradition of the Dionysiaca should be retained in a number of passages that modern scholars have tried to emend; e. g. A. Ludwig in his edition (Leipzig, 1909 and 1911). The style of Nonnus is interestingly illustrated in a number of citations.

Porsons Gesetz (229-245). K. Witte discusses with approval the observations made by J. Král in his article entitled, *Porsons Gesetz, Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom griech. Trimeter*, which appeared in the *Sitzungsb. d. böhmischen Gesellschaft d. Wiss., hist. Klasse*, 1909, IX. According to this law a tragic trimeter, ending in a cretic word that is preceded by a word of more than one syllable, must have a 'rational' fifth foot, i. e. iamb or tribrach; hence Eur. Ion I, *'Ατλας δὲ χαλκέοισιν νότοις οὐρανόν*, is faulty. Král endeavors to eliminate the law; but Witte, on the contrary, using K's statistics, thinks the law formulates the aim of the tragic poets to avoid a pause before the cretic word, which would be felt, if the fifth arsis (not a monosyllable) is long; because such a pause would obscure the regular penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura. Numerous observations are made, including the similar treatment by the tragic poets of the trochaic tetrameter, and of the hexameter by the Alexandrine poets. A broad treatment of these phenomena is necessary.

Auguria salutis (246-252). F. Blumenthal discusses this ceremony which, hitherto known from Dio XXXVII 24, 1, Tac. XII, 23, Cic. de leg. II 21, etc., has now become clearer from an inscription recording these auguria for the years 1, 2, 3, 8, 12 and 17 (cf. Not. d. Scavi 1910, pp. 132 ff., and Comptes rend. de l'acad. des insc. 1911, pp. 49 ff., etc.). The inscription records maxima auguria for the years 3 and 17, and also that on the latter date an ordinary augurium was taken as well. B. reviews the military history of Rome to show why, in certain years, the ordinary augurium salutis was omitted, and why the auguria mentioned for the years 63, 29 B. C. and 24 A. D. may be regarded to have been maxima, and the only other one known (49 A. D.) was an ordinary ceremony. He connects the augurium for the year 63 B. C. with the capture of Jerusalem. If the augurium was affirmative then followed the petitio salutis, which was undertaken by magistrates, or priests other than augurs.

Nochmals Aedilis lustralis und die Sacra von Tusculum (253-272). A. Rosenberg maintains against Leuze (above), that the aedilis lustralis in Tusculum, must be distinguished from the political aidiles; hence should be recognized as one of the priestly dignitaries. There are indeed a few examples of lustralis in the sense of five-yearly; but nowhere is a quinquennial magistrate called lustralis, although they existed in hundreds of cities. Lustration of the community was indeed a magisterial function in Rome (Leuze); but this was not so all over Italy; e. g. in Iguvium a college of priests had charge of it; besides in Rome special lustrations were in the hands of the Arval brethren and the Luperci, and to this class

we may assign the Tusculan aidilis lustralis. That the Laurentes Lavinates, the sacerdotes Lanuvini and Tusculani were titles conferred by the Roman state (cf. Mommsen, *Staatsr.* III 579 f.) is disproved by Livy VIII 14, 2. R. discusses at length these priesthoods, as well as the sodales iuvenum in Tusculum, composed of maidens.

Der zweite Triumvirat (273-295). W. Kolbe argues interestingly that Octavian still held the triumviral power *rei publicae constituenda*, when the break with Antony came 32 B. C.; hence he was chosen defender of the state while in the capacity of triumvir; consequently in virtue of the coniuratio of all Italy he legally retained the functions of the triumvirate until he resigned them to the senate and people 27 B. C. While agreeing with Mommsen (*Staatsr.* II⁸ 720, 745) in these essentials, he meets the objections of Kromayer, who holds that Octavian obtained the supreme command of the army 32 B. C. by a coup d'état, as the second five-year term of the triumvirate, agreed upon by Octavian and Antony at Tarentum 37 B. C., had expired at the close of 33 B. C. But Kolbe, basing his argument mainly on Appian's *Illyricæ* 28, which was derived from the autobiography of Augustus, a more reliable source than the *Monum. Ancyranum* c. 7, and the *Fasti consulares* I, I, 37, shows that the second five-year term continued through the year 32 B. C.

Per l'interpretazione del testo etrusco di Agram (296-304). E. Lattes continues his discussion of these inscriptions (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 450), with the conviction of Bücheler, that a close relationship existed between the Etruscan and Latin languages. A genitive is indicated by 's, and words ending in m or n may be objects of verbs. The words: *fasei spurestres enas eθrse tinši(m) tiurim avilš xiš*, announce the celebration of funeral rites at the time of the new moon in the year *xiš* (forse 'quinto' ossia 'lustrale') and month *Tinši* ('Giovio'). Closely connected with this follows a frequent formula: *cisum pute*, in which 'pute' means something like 'potavit, libavit'. In spite of the enormous difficulties due to various readings, lacunae, order of words, obscure and unknown readings, the results are certi o probabili o possibili.

Zur ersten Rede des Antiphon (305-310). H. Mutschmann objects to Thalheim's transpositions in this speech (see above). The present order is characteristic of Antiphon's sophistic style of argumentation. The second *wās* sentence (§ 7) is genuine and the traditional order correct.

Miscellen: F. Vollmer (311-314) publishes a few funerary inscriptions from Trent, Austria, collected by Aventinus in the XVI century.—A. Rehm (314-315) publishes his revision of inscription Miletus III, n. 164, following the sug-

gestions of v. Wilamowitz (Gött. gel. Anz. 1914, 108).—C. Robert (315–319) discusses the fragment of Pindar's VIII paean (Oxyrh. Pap. V 841, p. 65), which shows that Hecabe's dream, presaging the destruction of Troy, was not an invention of Sophocles (cf. Bild u. Lied 233 ff.); but whether Pindar knew the myth of the exposure of Paris is uncertain, hence the conjecture, v. 35 . . . ἔσφα]λε is doubtful. For Ἐρι[νύ (v. 30), read Ἐρι[σφάραυον (or a similar adjective).—A. von Blumenthal (319–320) finds the Hesiod fragm. 219 (245 Rz.): Νήπιος ὃς τὰ ἔτοιμα λιπὼν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει, paraphrased in Pindar P. III 21 f., who took the myth from the 'Hoiā' of Hesiod (cf. Gildersleeve's Pindar, l. c., v. 8); hence the above fragment can now be properly assigned.—P. Stengel (320) corrects his emendation of Plut. Cim. 18 ἀπέτεμε> ἐνέτεμε to ἀνέτεμε, as this form occurs in the very similar passage of Polyaen. Strateg. IV 20 (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 452).—C. Robert (320) substitutes Paul Hermann for Treu in Hermes XLIX, p. 18, and p. 19 n. 1; and p. 159 Weege should be credited for suggesting Aphrodite, not Nike.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XLI (1917).

Pp. 5–99. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines : Phonétique (consonantisme), Morphologie, Formation des mots, Vocabulaire, by Maurice Jeanneret. Intervocalic *g* is often written *c*; *qu* sometimes becomes *c* in the word *quomodo*; *d* is confused with *r* under the influence of Italic dialects; initial *b* and intervocalic *b* are confused with *v*; the semi-vowels *i* and *v* are sometimes absorbed; *v* followed by *u* is dropped; *h* is often omitted. Final *t* is sometimes dropped in the 3 pers. sing. of verbs; final *d* often becomes *t*; final *s* is regularly retained; final *m* is very often omitted. Certain vulgarisms appear in the declensions of nouns, and there is some confusion of genders—between masculines in *-us* and neuters in *-um*, between neuter plurals and feminine singulars in *-a*. Some deponents have become active; a deponent perfect has the auxiliary in the perfect (*locutus fuerit*). The tablets furnish 16 new words, and 21 rare words; foreign words are very rarely used. They give, further, such expressions as *minus facere, contravenire* ('engager une polémique contre quelqu'un'), *suprascribere*, the conjunction *sic quomodo*, and the preposition *desub*.

Pp. 100-109. Notes sur les recensions hésychienne et hexaplaire du livre d'Esdras-Néhémie ("Εσδρας β"), by Gustave Bardy.

Pp. 110-112. Bulletin Bibliographique. Review of J. B. Edwards, *The Demesman in Attic Life*, Baltimore, 1916 (Bernard Haussoullier).

Pp. 113-125. Passages controversés des Dionysiaques de Nonnos, by Paul Collart. Textual notes on II 143, XII 21, XIV 128, XXVI 235, XXXVIII 212, XLVII 649-650.

Pp. 126-153. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines (suite) : Syntaxe, Conclusions, by Maurice Jeanneret. The 'conclusions', pp. 149-153, indicate the importance of this long article to the student of vulgar Latin. An index is added on pp. 249-257.

Pp. 154-168. Bulletin bibliographique. Reviews, among others, of C. Sallusti Crispī Bellum Iugurthinum, Rec. Axel W. Ahlberg, Gotoburgi, 1915 ('une excellente édition critique', Paul Lejay); Mrs. Arthur Strong, *Apotheosis and After Life*, London, 1915 (Paul Lejay); John E. B. Mayor Alex. Souter, *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus*, Cambridge, 1917 (Paul Lejay).

Revue des revues (1916).

Pp. 169-184. L'exil de Juvénal et l'Ombos de la xv^e satire, by P.-Hippolyte Boussac. The place of Juvenal's exile was the Great Oasis (now called El-Khargeh) at the southern extremity of Egypt. The site of Ombos was determined by the excavations of Flinders Petrie and Quibell, in 1895; it is north of Nagada on the border of the desert, about four kilometers from the modern village of Ballas. In the battle of the Fifteenth Satire, the Tentyrites seem to have been the aggressors.

Pp. 185-217. Essais et notes sur Virgile, by Paul Lejay. XI. L'ombilic de l'Italie. Note on Aen. VII 563, 'locus Italiae medio', where Servius has, 'Hunc locum umbilicum Italiae chorographi dicunt'. XII. Le sanctuaire des Paliques. Note on Aen. IX 585, with a study of Macrobius, V 19, 25. Macrobius' quotation from Callias should perhaps be corrected to read υφ' γι καὶ τοὺς Δελφὸς καλουμένους εἶναι συμβέβηκεν. Οὗτοι δὲ κρατῆρες δύο εἰσίν, οὓς (sic!) δελφός τῶν Παλικάν οἱ Σικελῶται νομίζουσι. XIII. Les cinq éléments. Note on Aen. X. 100-102. Virgil distinguishes five elements; the air and the ether count as two. XIV. La neutralité des dieux. Note on Aen. X. 104-112. XV. Quin. Note on the expression 'non hoc negares quin', Aen. X 614. 'Quin' may be translated by 'but'. XVI. Doubles comparaisons similaires (Aen. VII 698-

705; X 132-138; X 270-276; I 315-317). XVII. Apparitions divines et effets de lune. XVIII. L'idée de la voix moyenne. M. Lejay finds four verbs in Virgil compounded with *ad* which have a middle meaning, *adparo*, *adservo*, *adsimulo*, *advelo*. XIX. Regnatus, triumphatus. Remarks on the use of the passive of intransitive verbs.

Pp. 218-220. Bulletin bibliographique. Review of J. W. White, *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes*, Boston, 1914 (Georges Méautis).

Revue des revues (1916).

Pp. 221-230. Notes critiques sur la version latine du Ηεράς ἴδαιτων, τότεν, by Max Niedermann.

Pp. 231-233. Sur un prétendu fragment de Lucilius, by Max Niedermann. In C. G. L. V 234, 1, 'pistris belua maris lucius "pistrices" dixit pluraliter', G. Loewe changed 'lucius' to 'Lucilius'. But the gloss is probably corrupt, and 'lucius' is merely the name of a fish.

Pp. 234-242. Remarques sur quelques passages du discours de Démosthène contre Leptine, by R. Cahen. Notes on §§ 15 (defense of the word *τιμάν*), 47, 55, 91-92, 95-97, 101, 115, 118, 130.

Pp. 243-248. Bulletin Bibliographique. Reviews, among others, of R. Cagnat et V. Chapot, *Manuel d'archéologie romaine*, Tome I, Paris, 1917 (Bernard Haussoullier); R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*; Zweiter Band, Satzlehre, Zweiter Teil; neubearbeitet von Carl Stegmann, Hannover, 1914 (Paul Lejay); A. Gudeman, P. Cornelii Taciti *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Leipzig, 1914 (Paul Lejay).

Pp. 249-257. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines; Index, by Maurice Jeanneret.

Revue des revues (1916).

W. P. MUSTARD.

BRIEF MENTION.

R. G. K.: *Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language*, by EDWIN LEE JOHNSON, Ph. D. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1917. Pp. xiv + 251. Price \$2. This convenient handbook is Vol. VIII of the Vanderbilt Oriental Series, edited by Tolman and Stevenson, and assuredly fills an empty space in the apparatus of the Iranian scholar, though like most such handbooks it is substantially only a methodical summary and arrangement of work already done and scattered in the various periodicals. It contains brief accounts of the decipherment of the inscriptions, of their location and publication, of ancient Persian writing and pronunciation, and of the Indo-European languages; then follows an historical account of the development of the Indo-European sounds and paradigms into the Ancient Persian, and a brief treatment of the syntax of Ancient Persian, with one or two excursions on other features.

When we compare JOHNSON's volume with Meillet's *Grammaire du vieux perse* (1915), we observe that JOHNSON starts from the Indo-European sound or form, and traces down to Ancient Persian, while Meillet makes the Ancient Persian his point of departure. For etymological comparisons and studies, one finds Johnson's work the more usable; but Meillet enters into a mass of detail which the more careful worker may not disregard, and which he will not find in JOHNSON's volume. This is astonishing in view of the fact that the two books are of substantially the same bulk; but the Vanderbilt scholar uses his space in giving a fairly complete abstract of Indo-European and of Aryan and Iranian philology, on which to base his Ancient Persian interpretations. This would obviously be a proper method, if the Ancient Persian were a language with an abundant vocabulary and entire paradigms exemplified in the remains. But it is very meager in both respects, and JOHNSON's procedure is very extravagant of space, often hiding the Ancient Persian needle in an Indo-European or Aryan haystack. For instance, after over five pages on sandhi and vowel contraction, in which not a single Ancient Persian example is found, the contraction of vowels in Ancient Persian is disposed of in half a page, including six Persian examples. Two full pages are used on the pronoun of the second person, though only three Ancient Persian forms are found; the irrelevant matter fills exactly one page of the two. Twelve pages on the Indo-European personal endings of verbs, with their develop-

ment into Indo-Iranian, are followed by four and a half pages on the personal endings of Ancient Persian; why devote three pages of the twelve to dual endings, when Ancient Persian contains not a single specimen of a verb in the dual number? It is a pity to load up a really good and convenient handbook with so much useless lumber: for even the author hardly expects it to be used as a general reference work on Indo-European processes and forms.

There are naturally points of detail where the reviewer would differ, but he refrains from devoting to such use the space at his disposal. The volume is, despite the superfluous material, a welcome complement to the convenient volumes already issued on Ancient Persian in the same series.

R. G. K.: *Graeco-Persian Names*, by ALVIN H. M. STONECIPHER. (New York, *American Book Co.*, 1918. Price \$1. The Vanderbilt Oriental Series, vol. ix), gives still further testimony to the scholarly productivity which one enthusiastic teacher may evoke in a little-frequented field of knowledge. This volume should be in the library of every classical scholar who has to do with Persian personal names appearing in Greek texts. Justi's *Iranische Eigennamen* is not very usable, both from its arrangement and from its date, and Professor Stonecipher's volume is a convenient successor, with the material carefully arranged. The classical writings for Persian names are listed in comparison with the known or presumable Persian forms; the graphic representations in Greek of the several Persian sounds are tabulated; the etymological elements of the Persian names, with their meanings, are catalogued, with lists of the names into which they enter. Thus almost any linguistic information that may be desired with regard to the names is readily available in such form as to be most useful to teachers of the classics as well as to professed etymologists and to comparative philologists.

C. W. P.: In his *Latin Diminution of Adjectives*, reprinted from *Classical Philology* (XI, 426f., XII, 49f.), Professor Walter Petersen has made a collection and classification of Latin diminutive adjectives for the special purpose of investigating those that denote an approximation to the quality of the primitive adjective, a meaning usually translated in English by the suffix *-ish* or by placing the word 'somewhat' or 'rather' before the adjective. These so-called diminutives of quality

differ in meaning from the great mass of diminutive adjectives in Latin, i. e., those which by enallage transfer to the nouns they modify the notions of small size, endearment, or contempt, implied in their diminutive endings. To this latter class belong many diminutive adjectives which the lexicons erroneously translate by means of 'somewhat'. The idea of approximation to the primitive adjectives is found in three classes of adjectives: (1) diminutives of adjectives denoting a large size or quantity, which starting from the diminutive notion of smallness developed a meaning exactly like that of dim. of quality, e. g., *grandiculus* 'rather large', *longulus* 'rather long'; (2) dim. of adjectives signifying color and of one denoting taste, *acidulus*; and (3) comparative adjectives in -(*i*)*usculus* (=comp. -*ius* + dim. -*ulus*). Whence arose this notion of approximation to the primitive adjective? So far as the dim. ending -(*u*)*lus* is concerned, it must have developed on Latin soil, for the Indo-European suffix -*lo-* did not have it. But I. E. -*ko-* did have this force, and, according to Brugmann, -*ko-* is the first part of the Latin suffix -*ulus*. Hence in adjectives of the third class, all of which end in -*ulus*, it was inherited from I. E. -*ko-*. Those of the first class, as explained above, got this meaning from the notion of small size. In regard to the second class which is composed of color adjectives and *acidulus*, all ending in -*lus* with one possible exception, the author holds that either some link must be found to connect these with adjectives of large size, or else the two Latin suffixes -(*u*)*lus* and -*ulus* had come to have the same meaning in prehistoric times, the notion of approximation to the primitive adj. thus passing over from -*ulus* to -(*u*)*lus*; and he then decides in favor of the latter alternative.

K. F. S.: Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur. A Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthuro Stanley Pease, Howardo Vernon Canter confectus. Pars prior. Apud Universitatem Illinoiensem MDCCCCXVIII. Pp. 103. \$2.00. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. IV, May, 1918, No. 1.) As a conscientious reviewer I felt that I ought to test the correctness of this index by looking up all the examples under a few words selected at random. I found no false references. But even if I had done so, I am not sure that I should have mentioned them here. Men who are at once competent and willing to make such an index as this of any great classical author deserve all the encouragement and support that the world of scholarship can give them. Hitherto

the only index verborum of Seneca's plays was in the Lemaire edition. It was incomplete according to modern standards, it was also out of print and not generally available. This new index is well printed, correct and complete. As soon as it is finished we shall have entire command of a series of dramas important not only in themselves but also because they are practically all that is left of what was once a large and important department of Roman poetry.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Andrelinus, Publius Faustus, and Arnolletus, Joannes. *Elegies*; ed. by W. P. Mustard. (Studies in the Renaissance Pastoral, 3.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918. 123 pp., 8°, \$1.50 net.

Bowman (H. Newpher). *The Crimes of the Oedipodean Cycle*. Boston, *Badger*, 1918 (Badger's Classical Studies). 62 pp., 12°, \$1 net.

Brownlee (Mrs. Louisa Alberta Griffin). *Helois, amicus humani generis*; a four act play; an adaptation from the Greek and Roman mythology. Seattle, Wash., *Dearborn Pr. Co.*, 1917. 10 + 68 pp., il. pls. por., 8°.

Buck (C. D.). *Studies in Greek Noun-formation: Dental Terminations*, I. *Camb. Univ. Pr.*, May, 1918. 50 pp., Ryl. 8°, 2s. net.

Caesar (Caius Julius). *Commentaries; the Gallic War*, bks. I-IV, with selections from bks. V-VII and from the Civil War; with an introd., notes, a companion to Caesar and a vocabulary by F. W. Kelsey. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1918. 40 + 137 pp., il. col. pls. maps, 12°, \$1.50 net.

Flickinger (Roy Caston). *The Greek Theater and its Drama*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918. 28 + 358 pp., il. pls. figs. map plan, 8°, \$3 net.

Gauvain (Auguste). *The Greek Question*; tr. by Carroll N. Brown; pub. for the American-Hellenic Soc. (Am.-Hellenic Soc. Pubs. I.) New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1918. 11 + 107 pp., 12°, pap.. \$2 per year; not sold separately.

Greek Anthology (The). With English trans. by W. R. Paton. (In 5 vols.) Vols. 4 and 5. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, July, 1918. Pp. 422, 412, 18°, ea. 6s. net; lthr., 7s. 6d. net.

Homer, *The Odyssey*. Done into English prose by S. H. Butcher and A. Lang. New ed. *Macmillan*, June, 1918. 452 pp., 8°, 10s. net.

Hopkinson (Leslie White). *Greek Leaders*; under the editorship of W. Scott Ferguson. Boston, *Houghton Mifflin*, 1918. 7 + 259 pp., 12°, \$1.

Juvenal and Persius. With English trans. by G. G. Ramsay. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, July, 1918. 498 pp., 18°, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.

Kallen (Horace Meyer). *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy Restored*; with an introductory essay on the original form and philosophic meaning of Job; and an introd. by G. Foot Moore. New York, *Moffat, Yard & Co.*, 1918. 12 + 163 pp., 12°, \$1.25 net.

Leeder (S. H.). *Modern Sons of the Pharaohs: a study of the manners and customs of the Copts of Egypt*. Illus. *Hodder & S.*, June 1918. 371 pp., 8°, 16s. net.

Messer (W. Stuart). *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy*. (Columbia Univ. Studies in Classical Philology.) New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*. 8 + 105 pp., 8°, \$1.25 net.

Plautus (T. Macclus). *Menaechmi*. Ed. w. intro. and notes, by P. Thoresby Jones. (Oxford Classical Texts.) *Milford*, June, 1918. 286 pp., 8°, 4s. 6d.

Plutarch. *Select Essays*; tr. with introd. by A. O. Prickard. New York, *Oxford Univ. Pr.*, 1918. (Oxford lib. of translations.) 19 + 336 pp., 12°, \$1.50 net.

Royds (Thomas Fletcher). *The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil: a naturalist's handbook to the Georgics*. 2d ed., rev. *Blackwell*, June, 1918. 126 pp., 8°, 4s. 6d. net.

— Virgil and Isaiah: a study of the Pollio, w. translations, notes and appendices. *Blackwell*, June, 1918. 135 pp., 8°, 5s. net.

Suetonius Tranquillus (C.) *De vita Caesarum libri 1-2; Iulius, Augustus*; with introd. and notes by J. Howell Westcott and Edn. Moore Rankin. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1918. (College Latin Ser.) 54 + 373 pp., 12°, \$1.60.

Thirlmere (Rowland). *Diogenes at Athens, and other poems*. *Selwyn & B.*, June, 1918. 128 pp., 8°, 3s. 6d. net.

Thucydides. *The Funeral Oration Spoken by Pericles*. From the Second Book of Thucydides. Englished by Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. (Sheldonian Ser.) *Blackwell*, June, 1918. 30 pp., 8°, 2s. 6d. net.

Virgil, *Aeneid VI*. Ed. by C. E. Freeman. (Oxford Jr. Latin Ser.) *Milford*, June, 1918. 160 pp., 8°, 1s. 9d.

White (H. J.). *Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius. Illustrative of Christianity in the First Century*. (Texts for Students Ser.) *S. P. C. K.*, May, 1918. 16 pp., 3d. net.

Xenophon, *Hellenica*. Bks. 1-5. With English trans. by Carleton L. Brownson. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, July, 1918. 507 pp., 18°, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.

FRENCH AND ITALIAN.

Anglade (J.) *Grammaire élémentaire de l'ancien français*. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 92 c.

— *Les Troubadours. Leurs vies, leurs œuvres, leur influence*. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 92 c.

Bué (Henri). *First Steps in French Idioms*. Paris, 1918. Boards, about 60 c.

Dauzats (Albert). *Les argots de métiers franco-provençaux*. 8°, 268 pp. Paris, 1918. (Part 223 of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.) Unbound, \$2.40.

Delcourt (Joseph). *A Shakespeare Primer for the Use of French Schools. (Classes de 6ème, 5ème, 4ème, et 3ème)*. Paris, 1918. Boards, \$1.20.

Ducros (Jean). *Le Retour de la poésie française à l'antiquité grecque au milieu du xixe Siècle*. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 60 c.

Gondry (Lieut.) *French and English Artillery Technical Vocabulary. Spécialement destiné aux officiers d'artillerie détachés dans les armées anglaise et américaine*. 140 pp. Paris, 1918. Unbound, \$1.

Guarnerio (P. E.) *Fonologia romanza*. 1918. XXIV, 642 pp., bd., \$2.60.

Guyon (B.) *Grammatica Teorico-pratica della lingua Slovena*. 2 ed. 1918. 343 pp., bd., \$1.20.

McLaughlin (J.) *A graduated "cours de versions" being a selection of French texts for the use of schools and private students*. Paris, *Garnier*, 1918. Boards, about \$1.

Nicod (L.) *Texte critique, avec introduction, notes et glossaire de: Les Partures Adam, les jeux partis d'Adam de la Halle.* Paris, 1918. Unbd., \$1.45.

Pernot (Hubert). *Recueil de textes en grec usuel, avec traduction française, notes et remarques étymologiques.* Paris, *Garnier*, 1918. Boards, about \$1.

Sperandeo (P. G.) *La lingua russa. Grammatica ed esercizi con la pronuncia figurata, contenente più di 3000 vocaboli della lingua parlata con le flessioni irregolari, una scelta di prose e poesie, un frasario.* 4 ed., 1917. 274 pp., bound, 90 c.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (James Turney). *The Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth-century Theater at Athens*. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (Reprinted from Univ. of Cal. Publications in Class. Philology, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 55-58, May 18, 1918.)

Arkiv för nordisk filologi. Trettiofjärde bandet. Ny följd. Trettioonde bandet. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1918.

Bennett (Charles E.) *New Latin Grammar*. Third Edition. Boston, New York, Chicago, *Allyn and Bacon*, 1918.

Bruce (Harold Lawton). *Voltaire on the English Stage*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-152.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

Burton (Ernest De Witt). *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament*, Second Series, Vol. III. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918.

Callaway (Morgan, Jr.). *Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels, with Appendices on Some Idioms in the Germanic Languages*. (*Hesperia, Supplementary Series: Studies in English Philology*, edited by J. W. Bright, No. 5.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918.

Cudworth (Warren H.). *The Odes and Secular Hymn of Horace. Englished into Rimed Verse Corresponding to the Original Meters*. New York, *Alfred A. Knopf*, 1917. \$1.50 net.

Dennison (Walter). *A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XII, Part II. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1918. \$2.50 net.

Flickinger (Roy C.). *The Greek Theater and its Drama*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918. \$3.00 net; postage extra; weight 44 oz.

Hart (Walter Morris). *Kipling the Story-writer*. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

Hewitt (Theodore Brown). *Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn Writer and his Influence on English Hymnody*. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1918.

Hrdlička (Aleš). *Recent Discoveries Attributed to Early Man in America*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 66. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1918.

Inter-America. *A Monthly Magazine*. English: Vol. I, No. 5, June, 1918. Español: Vol. II, Núm. 2, Julio de 1918. New York, *Double-day, Page & Co.*

Mnemosyne. Nova Series. Vol. XLVI, Pars II. Lugduni-Batavorum, E. J. Brill; Lipsiae, O. Harrassowitz, 1918.

Modern Language Notes, Vol. XXXIII, No. 6, June, 1918. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*.

Peppler (Charles W.). *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes. Part IV*. (Reprinted from the *American Journal of Philology*. Vol. XXXIX, 2.)

Pilling (James Constantine). *Bibliography of the Eskimo Language*. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1887. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.

— *Bibliography of the Siouan Languages*. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1887. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.

Powell (J. W.) *Philology, or The Science of Activities Designed for Expression*. (Extract from the Twentieth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1903.

Sanders (Henry A.). *The Washington Manuscript of The Epistles of Paul. The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part II*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1918. \$1.25 net.

Shakespeare (The Yale). *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. Edited by Charlton M. Lewis. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1918.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XV, No. 2, April, 1918. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina*.

— Vol. XV, No. 3, July, 1918. *Death and Life: An Alliterative Poem*. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by J. H. Hanford and J. M. Steadman, Jr. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina*.

Universidad de la Habana. *Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias*. Vol. XXVI, Núm. 1, Enero y Febrero de 1918. Habana, Imprenta "El Siglo XX".

University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. IV, No. 2, May, 1918. *Index Verborum Quae in Senecae Fabulis necnon in Octavia Praetexta Reperiuntur*. A. Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthur Stanley Pease, Howard Vernon Canter Confectus. Part 1. Urbana, *University of Illinois*. Price \$2.00.

Van Leeuwen (J., J. F.) *Enchiridium dictionis epicae. Editio altera aucta et emendata*. Lugduni Batavorum, *A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij*, 1918. fl. 6.50.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX, 4

WHOLE NO. 156.

I.—AN ‘INSPIRED MESSAGE’ IN THE AUGUSTAN POETS.

THE APOLLO CULT, THE SIBYL AND THE IMPERIAL THEME.

The history of the Apollo cult in Italy has been so admirably summarized by Wissowa¹ that it needs but brief review. The date of the introduction of the cult is not known, but it must have been, as tradition claims, near the end of the regal period, undoubtedly before 496, the first certain consultation of the Sibylline books which led to the reception of Demeter, Dionysus and Core.² As the Sibyl and her oracles stood in the closest relation to Apollo,³ it must be supposed that the Sibylline books and the God arrived synchronously and that the other Greek cults were brought in at the order of the oracles. So since the traditional view that the Sibylline Books came from Cumae has never been disproved, undoubtedly the Apollo cult in Rome too came from Cumae and indeed the Roman State appears to have recognized that fact⁴ by having sacrifices and gifts made at the Cumae temple of Apollo on particular occasions.⁵ And inscriptional evidence⁶ shows the spread of the cult from Cumae not only through Campania and Lower Italy, but throughout Latium. There is no evidence about the time and

¹ R. K. pp. 73-8, 293-7.

² Dion. Hal. VI. 17, 3.

³ Tib. II. 5, 15; Cic. de div. I. 115; II. 113; Serv. Aen. III. 332.

⁴ Serv. Aen. VI. 9; Liv. XLIII. 13, 4; Stat. Silv. IV. 3, 115.

⁵ August. c. d. III. 11; Obseq. 28 (87) on A. U. C. 624=130 B. C.

⁶ See Wissowa, R. K. p. 294, note 4.

occasion of the entrance of the Apollo cult in Rome. Just as Demeter was brought into Rome at the time of a bad harvest, so Apollo may have been summoned after a pestilence, for he was worshipped in Rome first as a god of healing.¹ His oldest place of worship in Rome was the Apollinar on the Prata Flaminia² and here his first temple was dedicated in 431 after a pestilence,³ the only Apollo temple in Rome probably till the time of Augustus. The worship of Apollo here as in the later Palatine temple⁴ included Latona and Diana.

The Apollo cult like all other Greek cults had a special development at the time of the second Punic war; witness the establishment in 212 of the ludi Apollinares.⁵ Moreover, as during this period the influence of the Sibylline oracles increased, Apollo too must have gained in prestige and power.

As to the history of the Sibylline oracles, Wissowa and Roscher⁶ have summarized and clarified the mass of traditional and controversial material. The debatable issues are not the subject of this paper, and we need only to review briefly certain high water-marks in the traditional history of the oracle before the time of Augustus, which are significant for us.

The origin of Sibyl worship lies shrouded in mystery. The name Sibyl is of doubtful etymology and the use of the word seems to have been first as an individual name, then as a generic term, as the legend of one prophetic woman gave way to stories of several (ten even named by Varro). Various places too claimed to be the birthplace of the Sibyl or places to which she had journeyed, and aetiological myths followed to explain the spread of the Sibyl cult. Significant for this paper is the fact that the oldest claim for the birthplace of the Sibyl seems to have come from Marpessus in the Troad and that the Sibyl of Marpessus is connected with the legends of the Trojan war, is said to have prophesied the destruction of Troy and is spoken of as the γυνὴ γαμετή of Apollo.⁷ The most famous of the Greek Sibyls,

¹ Quintil. inst. or. III. 7, 8; August. c. d. IV. 21; Liv. IV. 25, 3; XL. 51, 6.

² Liv. III. 63, 7.

³ Liv. IV. 25, 3; 29, 7.

⁴ Prop. II. 31, 15 f.

⁵ Liv. XXV. 12, 15.

⁶ Wissowa, R. K. pp. 536-543; Rosch. Lex. pp. 790-813.

⁷ Roscher p. 797; Paus. 10, 12, 2.

the Sibyl of Erythrae, seems to have supplanted the prestige of the Maressian. Erythrae claimed that the Sibyl was born to a nymph in a cave on Mt. Corycus, that from her earliest years she had spoken in verse and in tender youth had been consecrated by her parents to the temple of Apollo, and there had given forth oracles.¹ With this Erythraean Sibyl, the Cumaean is identical according to Pseudo-Aristoteles,² and apparently the Cumaean oracles did come from Erythrae.³ Against the old legend of the Erythraean Sibyl's wandering to Cumae, local patriotism, however, claimed that the Cumaean Sibyl was born there and her name was Demo. But the oracles were Greek and were under the protection of the Greek Apollo.

The coming of the Cumaean Sibyl to Rome was associated in the old saga inevitably with the Tarquins,⁴ and the picturesque details of the sale of the books helped to fix the association of the oracles with that foreign dynasty of monarchs.⁵ A further connection between these rulers and Cumae is made by the tradition that Tarquinius Superbus took refuge at Cumae after his expulsion from Rome.⁶ Warde Fowler thinks that it may have been due to the great Etruscan disturbances of the period that Rome came to make trial of the Sibylline utterances.⁷ Certainly the names of Cumae and the Sibyl were most intimately associated in Rome with the Tarquin kings.

The time when these oracular sayings were gathered and deposited in the coffers of the Capitoline temple is uncertain. They were burned in 83;⁸ and later (76) were replaced in the rebuilt capitol by a new collection, gathered by a commission sent by the state to all places famous for the activity of Sibyls.⁹ In the 1000 verses thus gathered, forgeries were introduced, made with particular political references.¹⁰

¹ Paus. 10, 12, 2; Hermias on Plato, *Phaedrus* 244; Eus. or. ad sanctos, 18.

² De mirab. ausc. 838 a 8 sq.

³ Martianus Capella de nupt. phil. 3, 44, 19.

⁴ Varro in Lactantius, inst. I. 6.

⁵ Serv. Aen. VI. 72; Cass. Dio. fr. 10, 8; Plin. n. h. XIII. 88; Diels 80 f.

⁶ Varro ant. rer. div. B. IV.; Gell. I. 19; Lyd. de mens. IV. 47.

⁷ Relig. Exper. of the Roman People, p. 258.

⁸ Dion. Hal. IV. 62, 6; Cass. Dio. fr. 102, 2.

⁹ Varro and Fenestella in Lact. inst. I. 6; de ira dei 22, 6; Dion. Hal. IV. 62, 6; Tac. ann. VI. 12.

¹⁰ Wissowa, R. K., p. 537, note 4.

The care of the books had been entrusted first to *duoviri sacris faciundis*, who in 367 B. C. gave way to decemviri.¹ Still later the number of these priests was increased to fifteen² and the board became one of tremendous prestige. No unauthorized person was allowed to approach the oracles³ and a decree of the senate was necessary before the quindecimviri consulted them.⁴

The customary Roman use of the books was under the pressure of *religio* at the time of some national crisis (rain of stone, pestilence, disaster or war, earthquakes, famines, abortions), to restore the *pax deum*. As measures of relief, the Sibylline books ordered the introduction of various Greek gods, the establishment of festivals, *lectisternia*, *supplicationes*, sacrifices, processions. Since however, the oracles, to prove their reliability, at times referred to events in the past and even pointed to complications and solutions arising in the future, great opportunity was given for the ingenuity and discretion of the quindecimviri in the interpretation of references in the pure old Sibylline sayings which were not aimed at Roman conditions. The possibility of manipulation of the oracles was aided by the language, which shared the obscurity and double meaning of all oracular poetry, and by the acrostic form (the first line of the saying determining the first letters of all the verses).⁵ So even if fictitious sayings were not introduced for specific purposes, still warnings, commands and prophecies which served as weapons to political parties could be constructed out of the sacred mandates, and the oracles were thus manipulated. For example, Cornelius Lentulus, the confederate of Catiline, circulated a Sibylline oracle according to which three Cornelii would be called to power.⁶ In 57, an oracle was made known that danger threatened Rome unless a banished Egyptian king should be restored to power by force.⁷ Familiar also is the oracle inspired by Caesar or his friends that the Parthians could be conquered only by a king and that the one who was actually king should also assume the title.⁸

¹ Liv. VI. 37, 12; 42, 2.

² Wiss. R. K., p. 535, n. 2.

³ Cic. de leg. II. 30; Lact. inst. I. 6, 13.

⁴ Cic. de div. II. 112; Dion. Hal. IV. 62, 5.

⁵ Cic. de div. 2, 54.

⁶ Sall. Cat. 47.

⁷ Cass. Dio. 39, 15.

⁸ Cic. de div. 2, 54.

Leaving this political use of the oracles, we must remember what Carter, Warde Fowler and others have clearly traced that the so-called coming of the Sibyl to Rome by various steps was gradually revolutionizing the national religion, establishing the Graecus ritus and giving more and more prestige to the Greek Gods. The culmination of the work of the oracle and its god came in the Augustan age.

The religious policies of Octavius seem as deep-laid and deliberate as his political and most subtly interwoven with them. Wissowa has pointed out the steps¹ by which the Emperor advanced to the headship of the Roman religion and has shown some significant features in its Augustan renaissance, how the Emperor made himself one of the Pontifices, the Augurs and the quindecimviri; how he revived the function of the Fetialis in his declaration of war on Cleopatra; how he organized the Sodales Titii and the Fratres Arvales, received from the Senate the right of nomination for the priesthoods and establishment of their numbers; restored 82 temples of the gods; revived old religious ceremonies. But all this activity (as Wissowa shows) was but in preparation for a deeper reorganization which purposed the rejuvenation of the Roman religion by finally establishing the sovereignty of the Graecus ritus and giving more and more prominence to the worship of the Greek Apollo.

Augustus did not become Pontifex Maximus till 12 b. c., but much earlier he was one of the quindecimviri and so connected with the cult of Apollo and the care of the Sibylline books when, in 28 b. c., he dedicated on the Palatine the temple to Apollo in thanks for the help given by him at the battle of Actium which was fought near a shrine of the god. Although the Palatine temple was *in solo privato* and was not an *aedes publica*, still Apollo as the patron god of the Emperor gained more and more prestige as the monarchy grew more deeply rooted and at last did not yield precedence among the state gods even to Jupiter himself.

Certain steps by which this strengthening of the Apollo worship was achieved are familiar. The Ludi Saeculares were celebrated by the manipulation of a Sibylline oracle and the assistance of the loyal jurist Ateius Capito. Apollo and Diana

¹R. K., pp. 73-8.

were given a new prominence in the festival and the Palatine temple was made the centre of the celebration. And at another time (the date is uncertain) Augustus had the courage of his desires and transferred the Sibylline books from the care of Jupiter Capitolinus to Palatine Apollo¹ "und [erhob] dadurch den letzteren zum Mittelpunkte wenigstens des ganzen unter Leitung der Quindecimvirn stehenden Staatskultes nach griechischem Ritus." The fact that in 12 b. c. Augustus became head of the state religion as Pontifex Maximus on the death of Lepidus was of small relative importance in comparison to the series of steps by which his will had already dominated the control of the state religion. It was not without deliberate policy, as I think, that in 27 he allowed the title *Augustus* to be conferred upon him in preference to any other, with its religious connotation and its suggestion of divine origin.

What are the probable motives which led the Emperor to make Apollo his patron god and to extend his worship? First perhaps because the worship of Veiovis, the old Roman god of the lower world, had been a family cult in the Julian gens² and Apollo came to be identified with him, in his function of a god of death, and possibly too because the goat was sacred to both gods.³ Then the site of the victory at Actium, under the shadow as it were of Apollo's temple, would inevitably affect a Roman mind trained in formal religious beliefs, which even when highly educated must have retained traces of inculcated *religio*. Moreover, the character of Apollo as god of healing on the one side, the Sun-god too (as he came more and more to be regarded), and as god of the arts must have appealed to an Emperor who worked for beneficial reconstruction of the war-torn Roman world and for the encouragement of the arts after⁴ the doors of the temple of Janus were closed. But more than this, the astute emperor (quindecimvir also) knew the enormous prestige of the Sibylline books and the support to be gained from them and the god who presided over them. I am inclined to think that the Emperor may have encouraged the quiet circulation of those legends that grew up: that he himself

¹ Wissowa, p. 76; Suet. Aug. 31; Verg. Aen. VI. 69 f.; Tib. II. 5, 17 f.

² CIL. XIV, 2387.

³ Liv. XXV. 12, 13; Macr. S. I. 17, 29; Sib. Orac. in Phlegon, mirab. 10, cf. Diels, Sib. Bl. p. 50.

⁴ Hor. C. III. 4, 37-40.

was indeed the son of Apollo ; that the god had been present in person at Actium to defeat Octavius' enemies ; and that he not only let himself be represented in art with the emblems of the Actian Apollo but that he encouraged the poets of the age to identify him with his patron god. Certainly I think I can point out in the Augustan poetry what I may call " an inspired message " (possibly coming directly from the Emperor, perhaps through Maecenas) which sought to emphasize the Apollo cult and the prestige of the Sibylline oracles ; to disassociate the Sibyl from the Tarquins and associate her in the popular imagination with Aeneas, the Julian gens and Augustus ; and often to identify Augustus with Apollo, and to interweave the exaltation of Apollo-worship with the Imperial theme.

Let us ask then, first, how Vergil shapes this " inspired message." To answer that question, one has to approach first the fourth Eclogue, with all its unsettled problems. Fortified by Conway, Nettleship, Warde Fowler, Skutsch and others, I venture to affirm with Cartault¹ that in this poem Vergil is first voicing the theme which was brilliantly expanded in the Aeneid :

Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet
Saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva
Saturno quondam.²

I am convinced, for simple reasons, that the poem is in honor of Octavius and so refers to his unborn child. Tradition says that Vergil owed his farm to the Emperor, and the language of Ec. i, 40-5, refers to him as a *praesens divus*. Vague as the language of Ec. 4 is, it suits better the child of the Julian gens than Pollio's living sons or Octavia's unborn child, especially 15-17. The expression in l. 15, *ille deum vitam accipiet* is similar to Ec. i, 41, which describes Octavius ; line 17

pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem

can hardly refer to anything but the welcome Treaty of Brundisium, made in this year ; and as Skutsch points out (paraphrasing Marx) : " Wenn Octavian damals ein Kind erwartete, so konnte weder der Dichter noch seine Leser im Jahre 40 ein

¹ Etude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile, p. 215.

² Aen. VI. 792-4.

Gedicht, das einen Götterspross feiert, der als Mensch geboren die goldene Zeit wieder heraufführen und schliesslich zu den Göttern eingehen soll, anders verstehen als von dem Kinde, das Octavians Gattin unter dem Herzen trug.”¹

Small points of verbal confirmation of this view are that l. 48 is similar to the address to Augustus in Georg. I. 42, and that Horace in the C. S., as I hope to show, echoes the language of this Eclogue in his record of prophecy fulfilled in the Augustan Age. Then lines 35–36 may naturally point to the menace of the East which Octavius was facing (the old Parthian *horror*) and the last line may suggest not only the Emperor as one who should enjoy the company of the gods² but with its “*dea nec dignata cubili est*” may vaguely point to that ancestor of the Julian gens who was deemed worthy to share Venus’ couch.

Still more significant, viewed in the light of Vergil’s later poetry, are lines 4–10, for the Aeneid was to associate forever the Cumæan Sibyl and her oracles with the Trojan ancestors of the Julian gens and the founding of Rome, and this passage seems, as Servius took it, to connect vaguely a Sibylline oracle and the Augustan Age. And the identification of Apollo in l. 10 with Augustus by Servius, “*quidam hoc loco*

‘*casta fave Lucina, tuus iam regnat Apollo*’

Octaviam sororem Augusti significari adfirmant ipsumque Augustum Apollinem,” helps to clinch the interpretation of the *puer* as the child of Augustus.

In Eclogue 4, we may then find a mystic, symbolic prophecy, arising out of gratitude to the Emperor, which identifies as though by inspiration the golden age of a Sibylline oracle with the new regime and which perhaps forecasts vaguely the thought that Horace was later to express in no dubious language that Augustus was Apollo on earth. But, of course, we are reading the fourth Eclogue now in the light of Augustus’ subsequent career and of the Aeneid; and so may force the interpretation. At least, though, we may say that here perhaps was struck the fortunate theme which Vergil later expanded in the Aeneid.

¹ Aus Vergils Frühzeit, p. 157.

² Cf. Hor. C. III. 3, 11-2.

Vergil himself recorded for us what the great motif of the Aeneid was to be, for in Georg. III. 1-48 in rapt, symbolic prophecy he promises that in due time he will sing a new theme; he will bring the Aonian Muses to Italy; he will erect a temple near his own Mantua and the Mincius in the center of which shall be Augustus Caesar; on its doors shall be wrought Octavian's conquests; and statues shall stand there (*spirantia signa*) of the Emperor's mythical ancestors *and of Apollo* (Troiae Cynthius auctor); this shrine will be no pastoral song, but epic (46-48):

Mox tamen ardantis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris, et nomen fama tot ferre per annos,
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.

The imperial theme and Augustus' patron god are already in Vergil's mind for his epic.

It is not my purpose here to review Vergil's sources for the Aeneas Saga, or for the particular feature of the visit to the Cumæan Sibyl. But I hope to show that there runs through the Epic as a clear motif the great part Apollo had in the founding of Rome and the Sibyl's help to his work, and that this motif is so closely connected with the imperial theme that it bears the stamp of an "inspired message."

Apollo, according to Heinze,¹ is not mentioned in the pre-Vergil tradition of Aeneas' wanderings nor in the later ones independent of Vergil: he works in the journeyings of the Trojans only indirectly as far as the Sibyl is his prophet. Cauer² thinks that Aeneas' visit to the Cumæan Sibyl may have been taken from Naevius and recalls that Greek sources mention a visit to a Sibyl,³ only not the Cumæan, but the Erythraean. At any rate, the Tarquin connection with the Sibyl's effect on the fortunes of Rome pales before the tremendous appeal to the imagination made by the Aeneid narrative of the visit to Apollo's temple and the rapt prophecy of the Sibyl. If Augustus had any desire to remove a possible stigma attaching to the Sibylline oracles from their connection with the Tarquin kings and from that political manipulation which made them urge Julius Caesar to accept the kingship, he could have found no

¹ Virg. ep. Tech. p. 83.

² Die römische Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius, p. 171.

³ Dion. I. 42, f.

better means than this brilliant picture of the real 'coming of the Sibyl' to Rome with the progenitors of the Julian line.

A tradition mentioned by Varro¹ said that Venus had led the Trojan expedition by her star. Vergil, as Heinze points out,² puts this aside and makes Apollo, in his familiar Greek rôle of Archegetes, the central, guiding spirit. And Heinze thinks too that the impulse to this emphasis on the service rendered by Apollo may have been given by Augustus' predilection for this chief god of the Julian gens.

Certainly, in the Aeneid, strong emphasis is placed on the prophecies which guided Aeneas towards the destined city and all these are put in the mouth of Apollo or his ministers. At Delos, Apollo warned the Trojans to seek their "ancient mother" (Aen. III. 79-101) and, when this was misunderstood, again Apollo through the Phrygian Penates tells them that not in Crete but in Italy are their *propriae sedes* (Aen. III. 143-178). Again at the Strophades the harpy Celaeno voices Apollo's prophecies about the difficulties before them. Helenus, the priest of Phoebus, tells them of long wandering ahead, but reassures them with the word, *fata viam invenient aderitque vocatus Apollo* (Aen. III. 369-462). The sixth book is largely an exaltation of Apollo's final work for the destinies of Rome as Aeneas makes his appeal and vows to the god, receives the promises of the Sibyl, and by her is conducted to the lower world and given the vision of Rome's future greatness. There is the heart of the Aeneid, and it is of but minor importance that Apollo himself appears later to Ascanius to prophesy the glory of the Trojans (Aen. IX. 638-658).

Yet the full bearing of the emphasis on the prophetic element (far greater than in the Iliad) might not be understood were it not for two significant passages which mark its connection with the Imperial Theme. The first is in Aen. VI. ll. 69-74. Here Vergil puts in Aeneas' mouth a prophecy of the Palatine temple to Apollo, the Ludi Saeculares,³ and probably too the transfer of the Sibylline books from the care of Jupiter Cap-

¹ Serv. on II. 801.

² Virg. ep. Tech. pp. 83-4.

³ I agree with Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI*, p. 142, that the festival established by Augustus is meant, rather than the Ludi Apollinares established in 212.

itolinus to Apollo's temple in 28 or 12 B. C.,¹ and the power of the quindecimviri. All these are the actual steps by which Augustus gradually made his patron god the real centre of the Roman religion, and, standing as they do almost at the beginning of the sixth book, they bestow at once the prestige of its exaltation of Apollo and Sibyl worship on Augustus' work.

The other passage that helps interpret Apollo's part in the Aeneid is in Book VIII ll. 675-728. On Aeneas' shield, little trace of the Homeric source remains, for the theme is

res Italas Romanorumque triumphos

and as scene after scene in the history of the establishment of Roman dominion is mentioned the climax comes in the picture of the battle of Actium with first Augustus, then Apollo determining the victory.² And in the last scene, the triumph of the two together is celebrated as Augustus, seated on the white threshold of the Palatine temple (almost as if the god himself), reviews the triumphal procession while the captive peoples pass before him with the spoils.

That is a fitting picture of what the Aeneid did for Augustus (with or without his suggestion). It presented forever to the popular imagination his political rule as under the protecting power of the great Sun-god. It also made clear the connection of the Julian gens with Phoebus, and prepared the way for the transfer of the Sibylline books to Apollo's care by showing that

¹ "Die enge Verknüpfung der Sibylle mit Apollo wurde von Augustus auch äußerlich dadurch hergestellt, dass er die bisher im capitolinischen Jupiter-tempel aufbewahrten sibyllinischen Bücher nach Einweihung des Apollo-tempels (9. Oct. 28) unter der Basis der Apollostatue depozieren liess (Suet. Aug. 31 vergl. Tibull. II 5): das sind die 71 genannten *magna penetralia* (Übersetzung von μέγα πεντράλια). Denn mag auch die Deposition selbst erst von Augustus als Oberpontifex vollzogen worden sein (Sueton. I. c.), so haben wir doch, wie in analogen Fällen (vergl. Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Altert. VII 1901, 276) das Recht, den Plan als solchen zurück-zudatieren, um so mehr als schon Tibull. II 5, 17 die sibyllinischen Bücher in engster Verbindung mit dem neuen Apollo-tempel nennt. Die ganze Partie bietet mithin besonders deutliche Beispiele für die in der Aeneis typischen Projektionen der Vergangenheit in die Gegenwart."—Norden, p. 142.

² 677-681, 704-6. Consult Conington's note, III¹, p. 155, l. 704, to see how little he appreciated the significance of Apollo's presence.

the Sibyl as Apollo's servant shared his work in the founding of Rome.¹

The way in which the Apollo theme works out in Horace is as different from Vergil's use of it as would be expected from the character of his poetry. There are two early, semi-satirical references to the god, one in satire I. 9 where, after the episode with the bore, Horace, in imitation of Lucilius and of Homer, attributes his rescue to the god,

sic me servavit Apollo;²

and the other a humorous reference to the double meanings of Apollo's oracles.³ There are also numerous insignificant references to Apollo as god of prophecy, as god of music and the lyre, and as the god of the bow. More interesting to us are the references to Palatine temple and library. In C. I. 31, Horace makes libation to Apollo on the dedication of his temple and prays for mind unimpaired and lyre ever tuneful from the god of healing and music. In Ep. I. 3, 16-17, the poet admonishes a young writer against imitation saying

tangere vitet
scripta Palatinus quaecumque recepit Apollo

and the scholiast (Ps.-Acro) has an interesting comment suggesting that by Apollo Caesar is meant:

Caesar in bibliotheca statuam sibi posuerat habitu ac statu Apolinis. Sensus autem: nunc contingat scripta Celsus ea, quae Caesar in auctoritatem recepit.

Ep. 2, I, 214-8 hints at the poets' ambition to get their works into the Palatine library, and Ep. II. 2, 92-4 apparently satirizes Propertius' desire to secure that recognition for himself and may be a fling at his elaborate description of the Apollo temple (Prop. II. 31). For Horace himself has stitched on his poems no purple patches of elaborate descriptions of temple or porticus to gratify the Emperor.

¹ For a presentation of similar points in regard to Vergil's use of the Apollo-Augustus theme, see R. W. Raper, "Marones: Virgil as Priest of Apollo," Class. Rev. 1913, pp. 13-21, and discussion by W. Warde Fowler, *ibid.* 85-7, and Raper, *ibid.* 148-51.

² Sat. I. 9, 78.

³ Sat. II. 5, 58-60.

Horace has, however, made free use of a subject no less gratifying and more adapted to his lyrics, namely Apollo and the imperial theme, and this even Vergil did not sing more clearly. The first great imperial ode (I. 2) after reviewing the portents following the death of Julius Caesar asks

Quem vocet divum populus ruentis
imperi rebus?

and the first god summoned is the

nube carentis umeros amictus,
augur Apollo.

After Venus, Mars and Mercury are also invoked, the poem ends with the praise of the god on earth who celebrates great triumphs (a glance at Actium surely) and who is the leader of his people. In this ode, there is no closer connection between Apollo and Caesar than this outline indicates.

In I. 12, another great imperial ode, there is a somewhat closer parallelism, for on answering the question of lines 1-3

Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clio,
quem deum?

Horace names last among the protecting deities

metuende certa
Phoebe sagitta,

and last in the great line of Roman heroes Caesar who is to reign with justice over the broad world. In C. III. 4, the battle of gods and giants gives an impressive symbolic representation of the struggle between Augustus and the forces of disorder in the realm, and at the end of the mythological picture with its discords of battle comes the beautiful, static vignette of Augustus' patron god (ll. 60-64). Then the moral follows:

Vis consili expers mole ruit sua:
vim temperatam di quoque provehunt
in maius.

The thought goes back to Augustus' triumphs and his later peace-policy (ll. 37-40) and the reader feels that Apollo as well as the Muses have given him gentle counsel and substantial aid.

Later in the last ode of Book IV, it is Phoebus who crashes a rebuke at Horace as he starts to sing of battles and cities conquered, and who directs the poet to the beneficent peace of Augustus' sway. The ode begins with the name *Phoebus* and ends with

Troiamque et Anchisen et almae
progeniem Veneris canemus,

and so in its short compass has perhaps a vague echo of the Aeneid motif,—Apollo's aid of the Julian gens.

Two odes are virtually hymns in praise of Apollo. C. I. 21, the beautiful prayer for aid to Diana and Apollo, ends with a stanza of confidence that Apollo, moved by the song, will avert war and famine and illness from the Roman people and their leader, Caesar. C. IV. 6, a sort of prelude to the C. S., addresses Apollo first as a god of victory and then as the god of bards, to whom Horace owes his inspiration and his art. Then the boys and girls who are to render the C. S. at the Ludi Saeculares are given directions which are significant for our interpretation of that song :

Lesbiūm servate pedem meique
pollicis ictum,
rite Latonae puerum canentes,
rite crescentem face Noctilucam.

That is, Horace himself tells us that the central figures of the C. S. are Diana and Apollo.

Now if the C. S. is read with this prelude in mind and also all Vergil's use of the Apollo-Augustus theme, I think the disputed point about the reference in *vestrum*, l. 37, is illuminated. Commentators have generally noted that ll. 37-44 probably took their theme from the Aeneid which had recently been published. But granted that, the *vestrum* in sense as well as in grammatical reference must mean Apollo and Diana, for Apollo certainly is the god to whom the Aeneid attributed the greatest aid in the founding of Rome. Then the emphasis on *Ilae* naturally follows the reference to Apollo's aid, which had been given to the Julian gens from the fall of Troy down to Augustus himself, as the Emperor would have the world believe. The association of Diana with Apollo in this work is the natural outcome of her association with her brother in the cult worship as in the Palatine temple.

With this interpretation of *vestrum* virtually the whole *carmen* becomes the *laudes . . . Phoebi . . . et Diana* which the last two lines of it and of C. I. 21 demand and the last stanza summons Jupiter and all the gods to bless the work of Apollo and Diana for the state. Whether the Sibylline books had already been transferred from the care of Jupiter to that of Apollo (28 B. C.) or were to be later (12 B. C.) so transferred, here in the C. S., to my mind, Apollo takes precedence over Jupiter and all the gods.

To support this interpretation of *vestrum* in the light of the Aeneid, let me digress for a moment to say that it has occurred to me that Horace, selected to write this official hymn soon after Vergil's death and believing perhaps that Vergil, had he been alive, would have received this honor, chose to compose the Carmen Saeculare in Vergil's spirit. For me it echoes not only the Aeneid (its theme in 37-44, the very words of Aen. VI. 853 in ll. 51-2) but also the language of the fourth Eclogue. The Sibyl's hand is felt in both poems. Phoebus, as the *alme sol* of C. S. 9, reminds us of the scholiast's interpretation of Ec. 4, 9-10. Lucina-Diana is appealed to in both poems in her function of Ilithyia.¹ A prayer for offspring for the whole Roman race takes the place of prophecy for one marvellous child. The Parcae establish such ages as the Augustan for the Roman world.² Earth's gifts are invoked briefly by Horace and prophesied elaborately by Vergil but the gifts are the same, rich crops, fruitful herds.³ And to both poets, it is a time when *neglecta Virtus*, the *virgo*, dares to return to the earth.⁴ This resemblance to Vergil seems to me more than chance coincidence.

However that may be, certainly like Vergil, Horace in his poems voiced a message of Apollo's help to the Julian gens, of the fit prominence of his cult in Rome, of his peculiar care of the Emperor, and his close association, if not identification, with Augustus.⁵

¹C. S. 13-6; Ec. 4, 8-10.

²C. S. 29-32; Ec. 4, 18-30, 37-45.

³C. S. 25-8; Ec. 4, 46-7.

⁴C. S. 58-59; Ec. 4, 6.

⁵D'Alton, in "Horace and His Age", while summarizing well the prominence given to the Apollo cult by Augustus, fails to interpret adequately Horace's relation to the Emperor's efforts. See pp. 63-7, 74-5, 109-110.

Let us ask next whether Tibullus uses any of these themes. We will exclude two poems in the collection of Tibulliana: III. 4, in which Apollo in a vision encourages an unhappy lover to win his cruel mistress, and IV. 4 where Phoebus is invoked to heal a sick maiden; since it is generally accepted that Tibullus did not write these poems and the use of Phoebus in them is not significant for our study. Neither is the picture of the god in II. 3, where the myth of Apollo feeding the flocks of Admetus is charmingly told to illustrate the power of love. But the one national poem which Tibullus wrote, II. 5, must be studied.

The occasion of the poem, the entrance of Messalinus into the college of the quindecimvirs, gave ample opportunity for the expansion of the Apollo-Augustus theme, and since the significance of the elegy for us is in the use of that theme, we may disregard as irrelevant the various controversial questions arising from the poem, namely:

I. Do lines 1 and 17 determine that the Sibylline books were transferred to Apollo's temple before Augustus became Pontifex Maximus 12 B. C.¹?

II. What Sibyl gives the prophecy, the Cumaean, or a Trojan?²

III. Are lines 67 ff. to be deleted, or not?

IV. What is the date of the poem and did Tibullus know the Aeneid before he wrote it?

Important as all these questions are, they do not affect the point to which I wish to call attention: that Tibullus' one national poem celebrates the Apollo-Sibyl-Augustus theme.

And just how does the elegy use this motif? It begins and ends with Phoebus. It summons the god to come with the laurel of victory on his brow, and to assume once more the garb of Citharoedus, in order to sing "new praises." That is, he is invoked in the familiar aspect of the Actian Apollo statue in the Palatine temple.³ Gentle he is to be now and to plunge the dire prodigies of Actium under the unconquered ocean. The Sibyl who is his servant has not deceived the Romans. She gave to Aeneas the prophecy of the founding of the eternal city on the seven hills. Other prophecies of Sibyls foretold

¹ Suet. Aug. 31.

² Maass, *Hermes XVIII* (1883), pp. 322-339.

³ Postgate, J. P. XXV (1897), pp. 55-7.

the disasters of the civil war and these have all been fulfilled. But now Apollo surely will give good omens of an age of peace. And then the elegiac Tibullus is off in an exquisite idyl of peaceful country life, and from there he runs to a hint of the sorrows of love even in peace of land, and then he returns to Messalinus and his future, and invokes once more the blessing of Phoebus on him.

Even such a brief paraphrase of the treatment can hardly fail to show those familiar with the poem that if Tibullus had not read the Aeneid before the composition of II. 5, and been strongly influenced by the connection of the Sibyl with Aeneas, the Julian gens and Augustus, then Tibullus and Vergil were both carrying out independently the same line of thought and in a way so similar that an "inspired message" is suggested.

Propertius shows in his poems one consistent use of the Apollo-Augustus theme, worked out in devious variations,—namely, the Actium-motif. The most famous, though the least obvious, use of this theme is II. 31, the description of the Palatine temple of Apollo, or the opening of a porticus. The first two lines connect the names of Phoebus and Caesar and although the battle of Actium is not mentioned, the poem itself gives a detailed description of the monument erected by the Emperor as a thank-offering to the god who gave the victory. And the Emperor must have been delighted with the poetic praise of the temple's brilliant marble, its golden colonnade, its Punic columns, the statues of the Danaids, the chariots of the Sun-god, the ivory doors with their stories of the defeat of Brennus and the death of Niobe's children, the statues of Apollo Citharoedus, his mother and sister, and the four victims about the altar, so marvellously wrought by Myron's hand.

Another type of variation on the Actium theme is the palinode. In III. 3, Propertius used this *recusatio* to explain his writing on love instead of national themes and makes Phoebus responsible for turning his little chariot into smooth fields. Actium and Octavius are not mentioned here, but Phoebus' protection of a grand theme against slight talent connects this palinode with the one in IV, where Propertius essays to sing of the battle of Actium and is checked by the same god. The two poems are also connected by similar phrases: Propertius

is not afraid of rivalling Ennius¹ now, and now his foaming steed will press on to the goal of the imperial theme.² The poem IV. 1 begins its praise of maxima Roma with vivid contrasts of the little town founded by Phrygian Aeneas and the Rome of Augustus symbolized by the golden temple on the Palatine sacred to Phoebus Navalis. That is, the first four lines give as word-motifs—for a theme like that of the Aeneid,—maxima Roma, Phrygem Aenean, Naval Phoebo, sacra Palatia, and the poem goes on to say that the glory of Rome dates from that day when filial Aeneas started from burning Troy and Venus bore hither her Caesar's weapons; the Cumæan Sibyl and the prophet at Troy gave true prophecies.

Then as the poet exults in his national theme, he is told by a Babylonian seer that Apollo is estranged and that the god of poetry had granted him a smaller strain

et vetat insano verba tonare Foro.

That is, the poem from 71 on takes the palinode form.

Two minor points of interpretation may be noted: that Propertius seems to be following Vergil's lead in the various features of this national poem (the Aeneas legend, the Cumæan Sibyl, the Actium victory),³ and that the allusion to the Sibyl and the *vatis* may show knowledge of the two different traditions one of which connected Aeneas with the Sibyl of Cumæ,—the other with the Sibyl of Marpessus in the Troad,⁴ for it seems to me as probable that the *vatis* of 51 refers to her as to Cassandra.

The slight connection with Actium in the first two types of poem pales before the elaborate development of the themes, III. 11 and IV. 6. In III. 11, every horror that Rome feared from Cleopatra is voiced (29-46) and then the relief of victory is expressed in thanks to Augustus. Next the theme is handed over to the god of Actium:

Leucadius versas acies memorabit Apollo.
tantum operis belli sustulit una dies.

¹ III. 3, 5-6; IV. 1, 61-4.

² III. 3, 18; IV. 1, 69-70.

³ Cp. also Prop. III. 11, 41 with Aen. VIII. 698-9; Prop. III. 11, 51 and Aen. VIII. 710, etc.

⁴ 49-54. In 50 I take *Remo* as dat. with *pianda* not with *dixit* as Butler does.

And at the end every sailor on the Ionian sea is told to remember that he owes the freedom of the sea to Caesar.

Most brilliant of all descriptions of the battle of Actium is that in IV. 6 and nowhere in the Augustan poetry is the significance of the theme more clearly stated (11-14) :

Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem :
res est, Calliope, digna favore tuo.
Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina : Caesar
dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse vaces.

Propertius strikes even more daringly the note which Horace sounded at the end of the C. S.: Jupiter himself is to give ear to the Apollo-Caesar theme. Lines 14-68 picture the battle, fought near Phoebus' shrine, and as the dark comes, Phoebus in flashing armour standing over the ship of Augustus utters magnificent exhortation with lines that the world writes large to-day (51-2) :

frangit et attollit vires in milite causa ;
quae nisi iusta subest, excutit arma pudor.

Then the god hurled his shafts and Caesar's spear followed his arrow. *Vincit Roma fide Phoebi*—the star and voice of Julius Caesar rain approval from the sky. And Cleopatra flees amidst the exulting blast of Triton's horn and the plaudits of all the sea goddesses for the standards of liberty. Then the strain drops to the monument of the victory,

Actius hinc traxit Phoebus monumenta. . . .

Apollo Citharoedus appears. The *ludi quinquennales* in honor of Actium are celebrated and future victories are prophesied for the Emperor.

Apart from the probable date of the poem (16 B. C.) internal evidence suggests that Propertius must have known Vergil's picture of Actium on Aeneas' shield from the parallelism of certain lines. In the Aeneid (VIII. 678-80) Augustus is pictured standing on the prow of his ship; in Prop. (27-30) the emphasis is placed on Phoebus standing above the prow of Augustus. In the Aen. (VIII. 681) the star of Julius shines above the head of Augustus; in Prop. (59-60) the father looks down from the star and speaks to Augustus. In the Aen. (VIII. 704 ff.) Apollo's arrows turn the tide of battle and so in Prop. 55-58.

If further suggestion were needed of Propertius' knowledge of Vergil's use of this theme, and his debt to him, we might quote II. 34, 61-66¹:

Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi,
Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis,
qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma
iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus.

We have further proof that not only was Propertius following Vergil in his use of the Apollo-Augustus theme, but that for him at least among the Augustan poets the message was an "inspired" one, for in III. 9 he asks Maecenas why he urges him to launch his tiny boat on the vast sea of the imperial theme; reminds his patron that in his own poetry he is but following Maecenas' rule of life:

parcis et in tenuis humilem te colligis umbras:
velorum plenos subtrahis ipse sinus;

and says that if Maecenas will set him an example, he will sing of great themes:

crescit et ingenium sub tua iussa meum!

Then his theme will be Rome's history. Part of that must be the Palatine hill and the last theme mentioned glances at Actium,

Antonique gravis in sua fata manus.

Ovid is in line with the other poets of the age in what we may now almost call a conventional use of the Apollo-Augustus theme. Of course, the very nature of the Metamorphoses demanded wide use of the many myths connected with Apollo, but these need not be enumerated. The Metamorphoses shows also references to the story of Aeneas which suggest Vergil's influence: prophecies given him of the founding of Rome; the ending on the imperial theme. In XIII. 623 ff., begins the story of how at Delos Aeneas under the guidance of Anius, the priest, consulted the oracle of Apollo and received direction to seek his ancient mother. In Met. XIV. 101-153, the story of the visit to the Cumæan Sibyl is fully outlined: her assurances

¹On the genuineness of the passage, see Plessis, *Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies*, pp. 154 ff.

to Aeneas ; the plucking of the golden bough ; her safe conduct to the lower world. Aeneas at the end pays tribute to her great power and promises to her a temple (Does this mean a share in the Palatine?).

‘Seu dea tu praesens, seu dis gratissima,’ dixit
 ‘Numinis instar eris semper mihi; meque fatebor
 Muneris esse tui, quae me loca mortis adire,
 Quae loca me visae voluisti evadere mortis.
 Pro quibus aërias meritis erectus ad auras
 Templa tibi statuam, tribuam tibi turis honorem.’¹

The Sibyl then tells her own history (a story not in the Aeneid) and of Apollo's gift of longevity.

Here as in all these stories of the Trojan war, Ovid seems to be leading up to a climax of the imperial theme, though with no such unity or emphasis as Vergil's Aeneid shows. In fact, at the end of the fifteenth book the great imperial passage seems hardly a climax, rather an afterthought. But there it is, and in the list of Rome's triumphs Actium finds its place :

Romanique ducis coniunx Aegyptia taedae
 Non bene fisa cadet; frustaque erit illa minata,
 Servitura suo Capitolia nostra Canopo,²

and among the gods of Rome, not only Aeneas' Penates and the di Indigetes appear, but also Apollo, in the Palatine shrine,

et cum Caesarea, tu, Phoebe domestice, Vesta.³

The prayer to all the gods is to vouchsafe long the favor of Augustus' presence before he shall join the heavenly ranks :

Tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo,
 Qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
 Accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens.⁴

The Metamorphoses ends on the Aeneas-Apollo-Augustus theme.

A few scattered references similar to the end of the Metamorphoses appear in other poems. Particularly, Fasti IV. 951-4 shows the same collocation of Vesta, Phoebus and Augustus as Met. XV. 864-870. It refers to the fact that when Augustus became Pontifex Maximus in 12 b. c. and in that office must ful-

¹ 123-8.

² 826-8.

³ 865.

⁴ 868-70.

fill the duty of dwelling near the precinct of Vesta, he consecrated in his palace on the Palatine a chapel to her. So the Palatine now, says Ovid, has *three gods*,¹

Phoebus habet partem; Vestae pars altera cessit.
Quod superest illis, tertius ipse tenet.
State Palatinae laurus, praetextaque queru
stet domus: aeternos tres habet una deos.

In Trist. III. 1, 31 ff., there is a long development of the Apollo-Augustus theme, worked out elaborately with descriptions of the Emperor's palace and the god's temple, ending with an appeal to Augustus for the poet's recall, but as this passage has an ulterior motive, connected with Ovid's exile, let us leave it for the present. Trist. II. 23-8 has a reference to the Ludi Saeculares and the Carmen Saeculare of Horace, allusion like the last pointedly calculated to win Caesar's favor.

Was there any reason why Ovid in exile should seek to win the Emperor by emphasizing the Apollo-Augustus theme? In the group of early poems, Phoebus is invoked repeatedly as the god of poetry, and is made sponsor for Ovid's love poetry.² Ovid even calls himself the priest of Phoebus:

Ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos
Ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores?³

At the beginning of the Ars Amatoria he says his 'arts' were bequeathed him by Phoebus⁴ and in the same poem (III. 3, 315-348) he prays to Phoebus that his poetry may be as famous as that of the greatest Greeks and Romans, with the Aeneid in mind last in the list.⁵

Here perhaps to Ovid the god is only what Mr. Warde Fowler calls Apollo: "a good example of the killing power of the conventional use of divine names in literature", but I differ from Mr. Fowler because I think this use peculiarly Ovidian, not that "by the time of Augustus this was practically the only light in which he (Apollo) was regarded by the ordinary Roman."⁶ Other references to Apollo in Ovid's first group of poems seem satirical and aimed at reducing the god to a name or less. In Ars Am. II. 493-512, Ovid makes Apollo appear

¹ See Peter's notes.

² Am. I. 15, 35-6.

³ Am. III. 8, 23-4.

⁴ Ars Am. I, 25.

⁵ 337-8.

⁶ See W. W. Fowler: "Roman Ideas of Deity," pp. 137 f.

to him with lyre and laurel and announce that all who wish to love should come to his shrine and learn to know themselves, for that is the foundation of loving wisely. Yes, Ovid adds, and of loving successfully. Obey the god. Surely, to an Emperor who was centering the Roman religion in the Apollo cult, it must have been offensive to have Apollo made the sponsor for this *lascivi praceptor Amoris*.

But Ovid goes further. In Ars Am. III. 113-148, he contrasts the luxury and elegance of the Augustan age with the simplicity and rudeness of early Rome and he makes the Palatine a symbol of all Rome's new splendor.

Quae nunc sub Phoebo ducibusque Palatia fulgent,
Quid nisi araturis pascua bubus erant?¹

He declares that the age of luxury is the one for him :

haec aetas moribus apta meis.²

And when he admits frankly

Munditiis capimur,³

he makes the appearance of Phoebus with his flowing locks an example of one style of becoming hair-dressing. How must the Emperor who promulgated sumptuary laws and favored homespun garments have regarded such praise of luxury and personal adornment with the Palatine temple and Apollo offered as models?

Again in Ars Am. III. 389-390 where Ovid advises maidens to see more of "life" and to display themselves to be seen of men and to capture,⁴ he urges them to visit the Palatine temple of Apollo in this business,⁵—hardly a reverent allusion to the shrine of Augustus' patron god.

It seems almost as if in such passages Ovid was intentionally satirizing the most prominent cult of the age—by saying, I too will make Apollo the patron of my life's work, the art of love; we must all follow the Emperor! In the Rem. Am. 487-92, he claims that Apollo taught him all these arts of loving :

Artes, i, perlege nostras:
Plena puellarum iam tibi navis erit.
Quod siquid pracepta valent mea, siquid Apollo
Utile mortales perdocet ore meo,
Quamvis infelix media torreberis Aetna,
Frigidior glacie fac videare tuae.

¹ 119-120.

² 122.

³ 133.

⁴ 417-424.

⁵ 389-392.

And in Rem. Am. 75-8, he prays Apollo to help him to cure the youths who come to him to be healed of love:

Te precor incipiens, adsit tua laurea nobis,
Carminis et medicae, Phoebe, repertor opis;
Tu pariter vati, pariter succurre medenti,
Utraque tutelae subdita cura tuaest.

Now may not these light references to Phoebus, little short of sacrilegious to an Emperor whose deliberate purpose was making the cult of Apollo the center of the Roman religion, have been a contributory reason for Ovid's exile? Two things, *carmen et error*,¹ sent him from Rome, he says, and it is supposed that the *Ars Amatoria* was the poem and that its *artes amandi* had offended Augustus, the formal moralist. But may not Augustus, the devotee of Apollo, have also been outraged by the sly satire of his patron deity? I think there are references in Ovid's poems of exile which suggest that he vaguely surmised that this might have been the case.

I have already mentioned two passages where an appeal for reversal of sentence is made to Caesar in the name of Apollo. In Trist. II. 22-8, Caesar is reminded that he has admitted the power of song in ordering the *Carmen Saeculare* sung to Apollo at the famous Ludi. Ovid adds:

His precor exemplis tua nunc, mitissime Caesar,
Fiat ab ingenio mollior ira meo.

In Trist. III. 1, 31 f., there is a long appeal to the Emperor for pardon, based on a beautiful and serious description of the Palatine hill, the place loved by the Leucadian god, and his shining temple. Is Ovid making amends for previous scurrilous use of the shrine? In Trist. I. 1, 69-74, Ovid has a very significant address to his Book, in which he asks it if it expects to go to the lofty Palatine and the home of Caesar, and tells it it was from that citadel that the thunderbolt fell upon his head. And he adds significantly:

Esse quidem memini mitissima sedibus illis
Numina, sed timeo, qui nocuere, deos.

Again in Trist. II. 543-552, Ovid reminds Caesar that while it

¹ Trist. II. 207.

was the writings of his youth that harmed him, since then he has written six books of the Fasti, that the sacred work bears Caesar's name and was broken off only by his exile. In Trist. III. 2, 3-8, he reproaches the Muses and the children of Leto for not bringing him aid, and says it is of no avail to him that his muse only was jocund:

Nec vos, Pierides, nec stirps Letoia, vestro
Docta sacerdoti turba tulitis opem.
Nec mihi, quod lusi vero sine crimine, prodest,
Quodque magis vita Musa iocata mea est.

Then there are several other passages where he speaks of an offended *deus*, or *numen*, but whether Augustus or Apollo¹ is meant, is a question. I am inclined to think, however, there is adequate evidence that in Ovid's own mind hovered a suspicion that one contributory cause for his exile was his satirical allusions to Apollo in his early poetry, and that it was well to conciliate the Emperor by appeals on behalf of his later religious writing, the Fasti, and in the name of Apollo and his Palatine temple. Certainly, in this later work, Ovid in his allusions to Apollo, the Sibyl, the Palatine, and Caesar is in line with the other poets of the age.

Ovid's message can hardly be called "inspired"; it seems rather imitative and necessitated by his fate. Tibullus admits no orders or influence, but in his one imperial poem may be following Vergil. Propertius, we have already seen, shows the influence of Vergil and acknowledges the request of Maecenas to take up lofty strains. While Horace in Sat. II. 6 disclaims that his friendship with Maecenas gives him any knowledge of Caesar's policies, he can hardly have been uninfluenced in his national odes by Maecenas, the diplomatist. Horace tells us, moreover, that Maecenas kept pressing him hard for songs.² Of course, the C. S. was written under imperial orders and Suetonius states that the fourth book of odes was written at the express command of the Emperor who set the poet the theme of the victories of Tiberius and Drusus.³ Horace too shows the influence of Vergil, most of all in the

¹ Trist. III. 8, 13-6; IV. 8, 45-52; V. 3, 45-58.

² Epode 14. 5; Ep. I. 1, 1-4.

³ Suet. (Teubner Text), p. 297-8.

C. S., and we know from the Georgics whence Vergil took his "haud mollia iussa." Maecenas' name stands at the beginning of Books I, II and IV¹ and in III. 41 Vergil tells Maecenas he will go on with the work which his patron has ordered, adds

te sine nil altum mens incohata²

and promises that later he will gird himself to sing of the battles of Caesar

Nomen fama tot ferre per annos.³

While this evidence does not prove that the poets of the Augustan age were given as an "inspired message" the Apollo-Sibyl-Augustus theme, it can hardly be doubted that the Emperor and Maecenas *did* in general suggest themes and influence the poets of the age, that this particular theme might naturally have been "inspired", and that the prestige and genius of Vergil, who so strikingly voiced this great motif, also influenced his brother poets. Surely, it must have assisted Augustus' deliberate policy of centering the Roman religion in the Apollo cult (that policy which culminated in the transfer of the Sibylline books to the Palatine temple) to have had the poets of the age express in such brilliant fashion the debt of the nation to the god of Actium, the Sibyl's help to the founder of the race, the glory of the Palatine temple, and its fitting guardianship of the Sibylline oracles.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

¹ Georg. I. 2; II. 41; IV. 1-7.

² 42.

³ 47.

II.—THE DATE OF THE VATINIAN LAW.

Early in June, 60 B. C., Cicero wrote to Atticus that Caesar would be home from Spain in two days, but Cicero hardly dreamed that momentous issues waited on that homecoming. The political situation in Rome was complicated. The harmony of the senate and the knights, which Cicero had established during his consulship, had been destroyed by the bickering over the Asian tax-contract and by the trial of Clodius. The popular party was practically leaderless. Catiline was dead; Caesar had been away for a year; Crassus was sulking at the greater favor shown Pompey, with whom he had quarrelled during their consulship ten years before. Pompey was the popular idol, though his natural instincts were rather with the senate. That body, however, had received him coldly on his return from the east, and, worse yet, had refused to ratify his arrangements there or to reward his veterans.

Three candidates were in the field for the consulship of 59 B. C., Bibulus, Lucceius, and Caesar. As early as December, 61 B. C., both Caesar and Bibulus were coquettling with Lucceius, who was wealthy and not too positive in his political views. The date of the election was already set when Caesar arrived at the gates of the city, but he asked for a triumph and for the privilege of standing for the consulship in absence. Being refused, he gave up the triumph and began his campaign for the consulship.

I shall turn aside for a moment to consider the date of the formation of the first triumvirate. The testimony of the ancient authors generally is that the triumvirate was organized in 60 B. C., and most modern authors have followed them (a convenient collection of references to the sources may be found in Sihler, *Annals of Caesar*, 80 ff.). Ferrero, however, misled, as I shall show, by Suetonius, says that the triumvirate was organized after the election, not before (*Greatness and Decline*, I, 283). The narrative of Suetonius (*Iul.* 19) is as follows: E

duobus consulatus competitoribus, Lucio Luceo Marcoque Bibulo, Lucceum sibi adiunxit, pactus ut is, quoniam inferior gratia esset pecuniaque polleret, nummos de suo, communis nomine, per centurias pronuntiaret. Qua cognita re optimates, quos metus ceperat nihil non ausurum eum in summo magistratu concordi et consentiente collega, auctores Bibulo fuerunt tantum pollicendi, ne Catone quidem abnuente eam largitionem e re publica fieri. Igitur cum Bibulo consul creatur. Eadem ob causam opera ab optimatibus data est ut provinciae futuris consulibus minimi negoti, id est silvae callesque, decernerentur. Qua maxime iniuria instinctus, omnibus officiis Cn. Pompeium adsectatus est . . . Pompeioque M. Crassum reconciliavit . . . ac societatem cum utroque iniit. . . . It has been observed that Suetonius is careful about chronology,¹ and it is also true that in such matters votes should be weighed, not counted. Yet the fact that almost all other ancient testimony contradicts that of Suetonius should lead us to examine more carefully his statements. A little study will reveal his real meaning. The sentence beginning *Igitur* is merely parenthetical or proleptic, otherwise *eandem ob causam* loses meaning. The important thing was that thanks to the corruption fund for Bibulus, he, not the dangerously neutral Luceius, was to be Caesar's colleague. The senate took two measures against Caesar: first, they tried (and successfully) to secure the election of Bibulus with him (my parenthetical phrase "and successfully" stands to my whole narrative precisely as does *Igitur* . . . *creatur* to that of Suetonius); second, having tried to render him as harmless as possible during his consulship, they tried to render him as harmless as possible after it by giving him a worthless province. Suetonius is not therefore necessarily inconsistent with the other sources in regard to the date of the triumvirate. Ferrero argues that the brief interval between Caesar's return and the election was not sufficient for the lengthy negotiations necessary, but he seems to forget that Caesar had been in communication with Luceius long before (Cic. Att. I. 17. 11), and might have been with Pompey and Crassus too. It is true that Cicero knew nothing of it till December, 60 b. c., when Balbus came to him with an invitation to coöperate, adding that Caesar

¹ Cf. Duff, *Jour. of Phil.* 34. 166.

intended to reconcile Pompey and Crassus (Att. II. 3. 3). It is doubtful if Caesar would have risked this rather hazardous prophecy if he had not already accomplished it. Of course the existence of the compact was not generally known until the agreement of the next three years revealed it.

I shall revert later to another misconception to which the passage in Suetonius has given rise, that the senate waited until after election to decree the consular provinces, and thus violated the Sempronian law. The interpretation given above may acquit the senate of this. Some possible consequences of their action, and possible implications of the phrase *silvae callesque* will be given later.

An attempt will now be made to enumerate the principal events of the year 59 B. C., and to establish their chronological order. I have spoken before of the attention Suetonius pays to chronology, and shall therefore begin with his account, which has the additional merit of being the most complete of the ancient narratives, though not itself complete. I shall supplement this by summaries of the events of the year as recorded by other ancient authors, and finally shall date these events as accurately as possible by references in Cicero's letters and elsewhere.

In outline form the events mentioned by Suetonius (*Iul.* 20-22) and by other sources are:

1. Publication of the *acta diurna*;
2. Revival of an old custom that the consul without the fasces should be attended by an *accensus* and *lictors*;
3. Publication of the first agrarian law; followed by
4. Expulsion of Bibulus from the forum, and his retirement to his house. Thereafter he contented himself with issuing edicts that he was observing the heavens;
5. Second agrarian law;
6. Remission of one third of the Asian tax-contract;
7. Other acts of generosity; during these
8. The arrest and imprisonment of Cato; and
9. The intimidation of Lucullus;
10. Clodius allowed to become a plebeian, while Cicero in *iudicio quodam* (i. e., that of Antonius) was deplored the state of the times;
11. Plot of Vettius;

12. Marriage of Caesar to Calpurnia;
13. Marriage of Pompey to Julia;
14. The Vatinian Law; supplemented by
15. A decree of the senate giving Caesar Gallia Comata too.
16. (Plut. Pomp. 47 f.) The ratification of Pompey's acts;
17. (*ibid.*) The election of Gabinius and Piso as consuls;
18. (Plut. Caes. 14.) The election of Clodius as tribune;
19. (Plut. Cato 31 f.) The oath to observe the agrarian laws imposed on all candidates;
20. (App. B. C. II. 2. 10 ff.) Exhibitions of every sort (as a result of which came 14);
21. (*ibid.*) The election of Vatinus (!) and Clodius as tribunes;
22. (Dio 38. 1 ff.) Many laws not specifically mentioned.

Never does Plutarch attempt to give a consistent and complete account of the events of this year. Thus in the Lucullus (42), he mentions 8, 9, 11 only. In the Crassus (14) he refers only to 14, and in the Cicero (30) he says only that Cicero asked Caesar for an appointment and later resigned it. More complete narratives are found in the Cato, the Pompey, and the Caesar. In Pomp. 47 f. he speaks of 3, 4, 5, 13, 12, 4 (again), 16, 17. In Caes. 14 he mentions 3, 5, 13, 12, 4, 14, 8, 18. In Cato 31 f. he says that 13 happened as soon as Caesar was declared elected. He then mentions 3, 4, 19, 5, 8, 14, 18, 17. Appian (B. C. II. 2. 10 ff.) gives the events in this order: 3 and 5 together, 4, 19, 11, 16, 6, 20, 14, 13, 12, 21. Dio (38. 1 ff.) gives the following list: 3, 8, 4, 5, 6, 16, 22, 14, 12, 13, 11, 10. Velleius (II. 44. 3-5) mentions only 13, 6, 4, 14.

A general resemblance is to be observed in the lists, not only in content but also in arrangement. In Suetonius, Dio, Appian, and, to a certain extent, in the longer accounts of Plutarch (though he does not always agree with himself), the numbers in general increase. The list in Velleius is too short to permit a statement. Certain points mentioned by Suetonius are found nowhere else: 1, 2, 7 (unless this is to be identified with 16 and 22), 15. Items 3 and 5 are not separated by Appian. In consequence 4, 8, 9 are sometimes mentioned with 3, sometimes with 5, sometimes only vaguely in connection with the whole contest. However, items 3-9, 16, 19 belong together in time and in character. I shall discuss the various events in order.

Items 1 and 2 are not mentioned except by Suetonius, and can not then be dated.

The agrarian laws may be dated fairly accurately, and with them the other events of the group 3-9 inclusive. It was known at least as early as December, 60 b. c., that Caesar would bring in an agrarian law early in the year (*Cic. Att. II. 2. 3*). This had been the procedure in 63 and also in 60 b. c. The first law seems to have been passed and the commission of twenty appointed when Cicero wrote *Att. II. 6. 2*, probably in April, 59 b. c. There is no certain reference to 5 before *Att. II. 16. 1* (*Kal. Mai.*). There is a reference to the oath that accompanied this law (19) in *Att. II. 18. 2* (written from Rome, therefore after June 1, 59 b. c.).¹ No other allusions are made to events connected with the agrarian laws in the contemporary letters except in *Att. II. 16. 2*, which seems to refer to 4 and to Pompey's expressed willingness to use force to defend Caesar's legislation (*cf. Plut. Pomp. 41*). I shall return to this point later. The arrest of Cato is not mentioned by Cicero, but it is barely possible that something especially spectacular caused the reference to him in *Att. II. 5. 2*, where Cato's opinion is highly valued by Cicero. This letter was written probably about the middle of April. The agrarian laws seem then to belong to the first few months of the year, possibly to March-April, as February was given up to hearing foreign embassies. If the custom of alternating the fasces was observed at this time, Bibulus would have had them in January and March; this however is doubtful.² Suetonius, Appian, and Dio are therefore justified in putting them early in the list of events of the year. Connected in all probability with the agrarian laws were the clashes with Cato, Bibulus and Lucullus. In *Pomp. 41* Plutarch says that Bibulus continued in retirement for eight months, which fits in very well with the other evidence. So too *Velleius* (II. 44. 5) says "Bibulus . . . maiore parte anni domi se tenuit."

¹ Cf. Abbott, *The Chronology of Cicero's Letters of the Year 59 b. c.*, in *A. J. P.* 19. 389 ff. Abbott puts this letter between June 15 and July 6. My independent dating of the letters of this year agrees in general with his.

² Mommsen, *Staatsr.* I^o. 41ff.; Willems, *Le Sénat*, II. 126-28.

I come now to the measure for the relief of the publicans. If this was the prize offered to Crassus for joining the triumvirate, it might be expected to come early in the year as evidence that Caesar was carrying out his part of the bargain. It is mentioned high in the list by Suetonius and not much later by Appian and Dio. It seems to be referred to by Cicero in Att. II. 16. 2, written about May 1, though it may be the whole question, which had been under discussion for two years, and not any particular proposal that was in Cicero's mind. Along with this measure would naturally go the other bill for the ratification of Pompey's acts, the rewards for his soldiers having been provided for in part at least by the second agrarian law. Strangely no reference is made to this by Suetonius (unless, as I have suggested, it is one of the numerous acts of generosity which Caesar performed, but it is mentioned immediately after 5 by Plutarch (*Pomp.* 41), between 5 and 6 by Appian and immediately after 6 by Dio. There is no certain reference in Cicero. Nothing forbids us then to put the ratification of Pompey's acts early in the year, even if nothing compels us to do so. This would be the natural place for it if it were Pompey's reward for giving up his quarrel with Crassus and joining the triumvirate. What the other acts of generosity were is unknown.

Cicero tells us (*de domo* 16. 21) that when he was defending C. Antonius, and had made some remarks lamenting the political situation, Clodius was made a plebeian, apparently because certain powerful persons had given heed to a garbled version of Cicero's words. The date can be fixed with fair accuracy. From Att. II. 2. 3, written in December, 60 b. c., we learn that the jury which was to try Antonius was being impanelled, but Antonius himself had not returned from Macedonia. In another passage (in *Vat.* 11. 27), we are told that Vatinius early in his term proposed a law *de alternis consiliis reiciendis*, which Cicero praises. At the same time he blames the author for waiting so long before having it passed that Antonius was unable to profit by it. The adoption of Clodius had been accomplished when Att. II. 7. 2 was written, about April 16. The letters of Cicero of this time are full of references to Clodius, most of them in connection with his proposed embassy to Tigranes, though in the letter just mentioned the chance of his

securing the tribunate was discussed. The first news that he was actually a candidate for that office seems to have been received from Curio on April 19 (Att. II. 12. 2). The trial of Antonius is usually assigned to the first two months of the year; it might have been a little later, but in no case later than early April.

Items 3–10 inclusive therefore belong to the first four months of the year. It is impossible to establish any more definitely their chronological relation to one another, except in the case of 3 and 5, which came in that order. For our immediate purpose, it is unnecessary to determine more closely the order of these events. I should conceive, however, that the order was roughly this: In the early part of the year, when Caesar was still trying to co-operate with the senate, probably little of an important character was done. If February was consumed by hearing embassies, there was probably no important bill proposed by Caesar himself before March (Vatinius, of course, who was inaugurated in the preceding December, might have proposed but not carried his bill *de alternis consiliis reiciendis* earlier). As the commission to execute the provisions of the first agrarian law was already active in mid-April (see above) and is not there spoken of as very recently appointed, we may imagine that this law was proposed in March; that the senate soon revealed its plan of campaign, as a result of which Caesar went to the assembly. The debates there and the obstructive tactics of the senatorial party may have induced Caesar to put through items 1 and 2 as entering wedges in his attack upon the prerogatives of the senate. Being successful in these preliminaries, he brought in and finally passed his first agrarian law. All indications point to a rather protracted debate on both the agrarian laws. During these debates at any stage might have occurred the attacks on Cato, Bibulus and Lucullus. Probably the next generation of Romans could hardly have told just when. The debates over these laws, the remission of the Asian tax-contract for the benefit of the publicans, and the ratification of Pompey's acts, consumed the rest of March, April and perhaps early May. During this intense activity Caesar still found time to assist the transfer of Clodius to the ranks of the plebeians, a proceeding which seems to have been decided upon suddenly and executed with haste (cf. Suet. Iul.

20: "Publum Clodium . . . eodem die horaque nona transduxit").

The plot of Vettius, whatever it was, occurred in the latter half of the year. Our sources are confused. Appian puts it before 6 and 16. Dio mentions it and the transfer of Clodius last among the events of the year. We have a full description of the affair, written soon after it happened, in Att. II. 24, an undated letter. The limits within which the plot came can be established. In Att. II. 24. 2 Cicero speaks of a warning given Pompey by Bibulus a. d. iii. Id. Mai. The letter was then written no earlier than this date. It is, as a matter of fact, too early, as Cicero had not then returned to Rome. The traditional order of the letters to Atticus of this period seems to be correct wherever we have sure tests (in general cf. Abbott, *op. cit.*), and we may advance the earliest possible date of II. 24 as follows: In Att. II. 21. 3 Cicero speaks of a speech made by Pompey on July 25. If the letters are in sequence II. 24 belongs after July 25, probably in early or middle August if not later. The assumption that the traditional order is correct is confirmed by the relation of II. 23 and 24. In II. 23. 3 Cicero asks Atticus to be in Rome at the time of the inauguration of the tribunes (December 10), if not at their election. At the beginning of II. 24 he enjoins even greater haste than he had urged in his last letter, which is probably II. 23, as there is no evidence of a lost letter. (This evidence has already been used so far by Abbott.) We know that the comitia (meaning probably the consular comitia) were postponed to Oct. 18. The relative dates of tribunician and consular elections is uncertain,¹ but there is no reason to believe that in this year they did not occur close together, no matter whether the consular or the tribunician election came first. Cicero wanted Atticus in Rome for the tribunician if possible, and would naturally allow him as much time as he could to get to Rome. We have no explicit evidence as to the time necessary, nor do we know precisely where in Epirus Atticus was, though our first guess may be Buthrotum. Probably six weeks is the least time necessary to allow Cicero's

¹ Mommsen, *Staatsr.* I. 580, n. 2 puts the consular comitia first; Lange, *Röm. Alt.* I⁸. 718, followed by Sanford in *University of Nebraska Studies*, XI. 304, puts the tribunician first. Our problem does not demand certainty. The difference in date of the letter will be small.

messenger to get to Atticus and Atticus to make the necessary arrangements and get to Rome.¹ We might then date Att. II. 23 as late as September first, though probably late August is safer, and II. 24 very soon thereafter. This fixes the date of the plot of Vettius. A *terminus ante quem* is established by Cicero's statement (in Vat. 10. 25) that one purpose of the plot was to discredit Lentulus in his campaign for the consulship. The plot therefore occurred before the election (about Oct. 18; Att. II. 20. 6). (Abbott dates II. 24 in mid-August; Baiter, whom Watson follows, August; Müller says merely before Oct. 18; Tyrrell gives no exact date.)

The marriages arranged to secure the permanence of the triumvirate have been variously dated. Velleius mentions the marriage of Pompey and Julia first; Appian and Dio agree with Suetonius in mentioning both marriages late in the year. Plutarch (Cato 31) says that the marriage of Pompey and Julia came immediately after Caesar's election. In Pomp. 47 he says merely that the match was arranged suddenly. This statement is confirmed by the solitary reference in Cicero (Att. II. 17. 2; early May), which speaks of *ista repentina adfinitatis consiunctio*. The early date of Plutarch can not stand against Cicero's testimony; neither can the late date indicated by Appian, Dio and Suetonius. Velleius here seems more accurate. We may say however that the historians who mention the events late in the year may have unintentionally misled us. There was a clear logical and rhetorical difference between these marriages, and legislation and historians might very easily displace, consciously or unconsciously, such events for rhetorical purposes. (This can hardly be true of Suetonius, who says that the marriages were arranged *sub idem tempus* with respect to the plot of Vettius. He may of course not have known when the plot occurred.) Modern historians are very likely to devote a separate paragraph to the marriages, even though in general following chronology. Nothing dates the marriage of Caesar and Calpurnia. It is mentioned in connection with the other, but this might be on logical grounds.

¹Acastus reached the Piraeus from Rome in twenty-one days, but the trip was made *sane strenue* (Cic. Fam. XIV. 5. 1). We shall be safe in allowing at least as long as for an ordinary trip to Epirus, though we can not be sure about any particular case without direct testimony.

Omitting 14 for a moment, I shall give briefly the evidence for the later items. Item 15 is not mentioned but obviously follows 14. Item 16 has been discussed above in connection with 6. The elections (17, 18, 21—the statement that Vatinius and Clodius were elected together is clearly wrong) were held in October, as shown above. Item 20 is undatable, but the games may have come in mid-summer, or perhaps have been part of the very numerous holidays of the autumn. Their position in the list indicates the former, and we have a period of several months (May-August, roughly) to which we can assign nothing. The same is true of the numerous laws regarded as unimportant by Dio (22). These too may have come in the summer months.

We come at last to 14. Before attempting to date it, I wish to consider the law in its general relation to the political situation. It will be remembered that according to Suetonius the senate decreed the consuls *silvae callesque*. It has sometimes been stated that the senate violated the Sempronian law by waiting until after election to decree the consular provinces, but the interpretation given above disposes of this charge. However legal their action may have been in this respect, it was certainly very foolish, and perhaps also illegal in another respect. Professor Rolfe (PAPA. 44. xlvii-xlviii) concluded that *silvae callesque* was a slang term explanatory of *minimi negoti*, and in A. J. P. 36. 323 ff. he has considered more fully the meaning of the words, and the identity of these provinces with the quaestorian *callium provincia*. Among other things he asks whether the senate decreed one province or two. Apparently no *silvarum provincia* to balance *callium p.* ever existed, and if *silvae callesque* means *callium provincia* there was only one province for two proconsuls (for these were undoubtedly pro-consular provinces; see the references in Rolfe, A. J. P. 1. c.). There arises in consequence a series of delicate questions, assuming that *provinciae* in reference to Caesar's time can mean one province. The declaration of one province for two magistrates would be about the same as depriving one of them of a prerogative if not of an actual legal right. In earlier times it was not uncommon for the senate to assign both consuls to one *provincia*: e. g., Liv. 32. 28. 8 ff. and 32. 48. 8 ff., etc. But this was a different matter: consuls, not proconsuls, were in-

volved, and Sulla's legislation was still far in the future. Bibulus apparently did not want a province—at least he did not take one until drafted along with Cicero after Pompey's legislation of 52 B. C., but the senate could hardly take into consideration the preference of a candidate not yet elected. Evidence is scanty, but it is probable that the senate always decreed two proconsular provinces and took it for granted, with perfect justice, that both would be claimed. In 63 B. C. Cicero did not take a province and Metellus Celer was sent to the vacant province of Cisalpine Gaul as proconsul though he had been only praetor (the title is regular enough). Cicero does not miss the chance to remind him that this more desirable province had been allotted to him through his own (Cicero's) self-denial (*Fam. V. 2. 3*). We do not know that Cicero had announced during his campaign that he did not want a province if elected but, if he had done so, the senate could hardly have taken cognizance of the announcement and selected only one province. His official announcement at least was made later: cf. in *Pis. 2. 5*, in a chronological list of the events of his consulship. A passage in *Att. II. 1. 3*, containing a list of his consular speeches—his renunciation of a province is the sixth—is bracketed by some editors. The former reference however is sufficient to prove that the real renunciation was made during his term and not before election. The list of praetors and consuls who did not take provinces is fairly long but we know too little about their cases to draw conclusions. It seems reasonable to believe that the senate regularly chose two proconsular provinces, filling one if necessary with a praetor or another promagistrate from a previous year. If now the senate did decree only one province, it violated custom if not an actual provision of law, and Caesar could thus justify himself for going to the people for his province. If the senate did decree two provinces, as is more probable, which can not be identified but were both worthless, they were again guilty of infringing upon a moral if not a legal right, and Caesar was again justified in appealing to the people. In any case their choice was a gratuitous insult to Caesar, whose election they practically conceded. That Bibulus, if elected, would have to suffer along with Caesar, was a matter of minor importance. Perhaps it

was the prospect of having to take a poor province that helped Bibulus to decide that he did not want one.

Let us now attempt to date the law. The preceding discussion has revealed the fidelity of Suetonius, particularly, to chronology, and to a lesser degree the fidelity of the other writers. Velleius gives only a brief list, but this seems very accurate as far as it goes. The most notable exception is in the matter of the marriages, and this deviation can be easily explained. One's first assumption would then be that the Vatinian law was passed late in the year. Unfortunately we have no contemporary reference to the law. Att. II. 25, written before the elections but after II. 24, for which see above, refers only to the general hopelessness of the political situation. Ad Q. F. I. 2, written after the elections but before the inauguration of the tribunes, mentions nothing but the attack of C. Cato on Pompey, and the chance of a prosecution of Cicero by Clodius. On the other hand, Caesar had offered in June (Att. II. 18. 3) to take Cicero with him as a *legatus*, which might indicate that Caesar already had a province. The same might be inferred from Pompey's threat to the opponents of the agrarian law: "Oppressos vos tenebo exercitu Caesaris" (Att. II. 16. 2, about May 1). But Caesar knew that he would have some province, and intended to have an army, if he did not already have one. He seems to have had an army of some sort the next year before he left Rome (Cic. post red. in sen. 13. 32). We need not therefore conclude that as early as May Caesar had a province. All that can certainly be inferred is that he did not intend to have *silvae callesque*.¹

In the absence of more positive evidence we may assemble general probabilities. First, the position of the references in the sources indicates a relatively late date, as already pointed out. Second, the character of the earlier events of the year must be considered. The agrarian laws were primarily vote-getting measures, as was that of C. Gracchus, probably that brought in by Rullus in 63 B. C., and certainly the numerous

¹ It was recognized that a consul on entering office was entitled to a province. Cf. Cic. de prov. cons. 15. 37: "Quo mihi nihil videtur alienius a dignitate disciplinaque maiorum quam ut qui consul Kalendis Ianuariis habere provinciam debet, is ut eam despontam non decretam habere videatur."

similar proposals of the early Republic (cf. my paper on The Conservation of Natural Resources in the Roman Republic, *Class. Weekly.* 8. 58 ff.). Plutarch repeatedly and significantly says that Caesar acted more like a tribune than a consul. The concession regarding the Asian taxes, which would gain the support of the knights, as Appian points out, and the ratification of Pompey's acts were partly vote-getting devices and partly payment of Caesar's political debts to his colleagues. The other acts of generosity mentioned by Suetonius, whatever they were, were doubtless of the same character. We know how untiring Caesar was in this respect later. Appian expressly states that the acceptance of the Vatinian law was the direct result of the lavish entertainments which Caesar gave the people, and the statement is generally, if not specifically, true. Incidentally we may recall the fact that these exhibitions can hardly be placed before summer and possibly not before autumn. Cicero frequently refers to the unpopularity of the triumvirs, and though his statements must not be taken too literally there is undoubtedly a measure of truth in them. It is by no means certain that before the agrarian laws were passed Caesar could have passed such a measure as that of Vatinius. This may be said without doubting Caesar's prominence as a democratic leader. In July or August Caesar tried in vain to stir up the people against Bibulus (*Att. II.* 21. 5). How long the dissatisfaction of the people continued to be expressed and not simply felt, we do not know. The triumvirs were hissed in the theater in July (*Att. II.* 19. 3), and about the same time the crowds around the edicts of Bibulus blocked traffic (*Att. II.* 21. 4). Without overemphasizing these statements we may still say that there was a substantial element opposed to the triumvirs. Probably later their discontent was in some cases transformed into a sullen discouragement, in others removed altogether under the cumulative influence of agrarian laws, political services, and lavish shows. It seems then that we should place the Vatinian law at least in the latter half of the year, probably in the last third.¹ It was Caesar's reward for service

¹ In any case it came before December 9, when Vatinius retired from office. Appian, as already noted, is certainly wrong on the year of his tribunate.

rendered, mainly, as we have seen, in the first four months of the year. Ferrero (G. and D. I. 290) suggests that Caesar's attention was directed to Gaul by the death of Metellus Celer and that the chance of going there was offered by that event, which he puts in the middle of February. I do not know what evidence he finds for this date: the earliest reference known to me is Att. II. 5. 2 (middle of April), where Cicero wonders who will succeed Metellus in the augurate. Nothing fixes more definitely the date of his death (cf. Pauly-Wissowa², s. v., where he is said to have been alive after the passage of the agrarian law). That the Vatinian law was passed on March 1, soon, in other words, after the death of Metellus as Ferrero puts it, we may safely doubt, as that was not a comitial day. Ferrero makes this ingenious combination to explain why Caesar's term in Gaul began on March 1, 59 B. C. I agree with him that other explanations of this are unsatisfactory; that he improves the situation I doubt. I am not even perfectly convinced that Caesar's term did begin then. The bearing of the date of the Vatinian law on this point I hope to discuss at another time.¹

The list of events as elicited from the sources is not complete: it omits, for example, the legislation of Caesar's colleagues, especially Vatinius and Calenus; it omits too the debate about Ptolemy and the negotiations with Ariovistus; most striking of all, it omits Caesar's own constructive legislation on the government of provinces. This received the approval of the ancients but is nowhere referred to by our sources. We may guess however with some confidence. Caesar could hardly have found time for such legislation before the middle of the year. The first four or five months were filled with political activity, assuring the position of the triumvirs and paying political debts. It is true that the agrarian laws were statesmanlike measures, but, even at this time, in preference to a popular but unstatesmanlike measure, a popular and statesmanlike measure would

¹ Mommsen (*Die Rechtsfrage zwischen Cäsar und dem Senat*, 42) dismissed the whole matter of the Vatinian law summarily: "Ob das Vatinische Gesetz vor oder nach dem 1. März 695 durchgebracht ward, ist nicht bekannt und auch gleichgültig." This remark may account for the little attention paid to the date, which in my judgment has more significance both for the term of Caesar and for our estimate of his statesmanship than Mommsen admits.

be chosen by Caesar. Incidentally the character of his laws makes me doubt whether he was after all entirely responsible for the bill of Rullus. I conceive the general order of events of 59 B. C. to have been as follows: (1) measures intended primarily to secure Caesar's position and that of the triumvirs—especially 3, 5, 6, 16 above (if some of these were permanently valuable, so much the better); (2) provision for Caesar's future—14; (3) constructive legislation. This would be roughly parallel to his actions during his dictatorship, when, after providing for his present and future positions, he took up the problem of reform on a large scale. Similar too were the programs of C. Gracchus and Sulla. Such a procedure reveals the combination of practical politician and statesman in Caesar. He realized that to accomplish anything for himself or any one else he must have abundant support: this we may say without attributing to him any far-reaching plans for reform during his consulship, and also without attributing to him any indifference to anything but his own future. The ease with which Caesar and his associates controlled politics, especially at first, may be exaggerated. Their victory was not an easy one. Prudence and statesmanlike self-denial alike dictated to Caesar the postponement of the provision for his own future. We must bear in mind the fact that while Caesar had given clear indications (clear to us, at least) of his possibilities, the Roman estimate of him at this time was less high, and he had to his credit no brilliant record to which Vatinus might appeal as had Cicero of Pompey's career. A rebuff at this time would have been fatal to Caesar. The natural procedure on Caesar's part was to wait until he was sure that his request would be granted; until he could show his associates that he had faithfully carried out his part of the compact; until he could show the popular party a substantial body of legislation in their interest; until to foolish and unnecessary insult the senate had added unwillingness to co-operate.

If my reconstruction is correct, our faith in Caesar's statesmanship is strengthened. Ferrero gives us a Caesar without political principles or platform, and this Caesar is probably as false as the inspired statesman of Mommsen or Napoleon. Caesar should have credit, however, for desiring the good of the state even during his consulship. When he could, he used

his position and his opportunities to put through valuable measures, and he combined the good with the popular whenever he could. Later in the year, he could ask for something for himself with the assurance that it was merely fair return for what he had already done for others. Unselfishness and policy alike however advised postponement. The Vatinian law was then, in my opinion, passed late in the year.

EVAN T. SAGE.

AIR SERVICE DEPOT, GARDEN CITY, L. I., N. Y.

III.—VINDICIAE PHAEDRIANAE.

The fabulist Phaedrus, as I have said elsewhere, was unhappy in his life and ill fortune pursued him after death. And in our days his remains and his reputation have suffered not a little from the undiscerning impatience of a generation alternately as precipitate in acceptance of a mechanical principle as irrational in revolt against it. The hope that I can undo something of what has been done amiss in current exposition and criticism is expressed in the title to this paper. My task is the exigent scrutiny of details ; it offers no room for the collecting industry which amasses its hoard without a suspicion that every coin in it may be base. It will involve consideration of the fabulist's idiosyncrasies, repellent, as it would seem, to more than one of his critics, and of the condition of his text which has been perhaps as much oppressed by the comments and corrections of the scholar as impaired by the corruptions of the scribe.

In the Fables, as now presented to us, there is much to cause offence ; many things, one is forced to think, that have been miswritten, miscopied or misunderstood. Hence a triple divergence in the ways of critics, some blaming the author, some altering the words and some contorting their sense. I will begin with instances where he has been reprehended for inconsistency, inconcinnity or falsity to fact.

No. XIV of the Appendix of Cardinal Perotti has been the object of more than one attack and the first two lines have not escaped. The crisp conciseness of the couplet

Vnam expetebant uirginem iuuenes duo
uicit locuples genus et formam pauperis

might have disarmed suspicion. But because it is not expressly declared that the rich suitor was low-born and ill-favoured and because the poor suitor's avocation as a market gardener (*hortulanus*) has to be understood from his *hortuli* in v. 5 and his *asellus* in vv. 11 f., the *breuitas* of Phaedrus (II prol. 12, IV epil. 7, III 10. 60 'breuitate nimia quoniam quosdam offendi-

mus') is forgotten and a lacuna of from one to four lines invented.

Through similar inattention the topographical indications have been blamed as obscure. The rich suitor had a house in the town (v. 8); and from this the marriage procession starts (9, 10) for his larger country mansion where the festivities were to be held. This mansion was on the same road as the poor suitor's cottage and market garden (which were at no great distance from the town, *propinquos—hortulos* 5), only a little further on (*ultra paulo* 6). The route of the procession lay through the city gate. Here (a very natural station) the poor suitor's ass was standing, and it was commandeered for the lady's use (11-14). A sudden storm came on; and the ass with his burden made for the nearest refuge, the cottage that he knew so well (21). What obscurity is there here? Has the critic stumbled over the application of *portae in limine* to a city gate? If he has not read the second Aeneid (242 *ipso in limine portae*), his author had (III prol. 27 f.).

At I 4. 2 Phaedrus has been censured for making a swimming dog see his reflection in the water. But the swimming animal is not the fabulist's but his editors'. The lines should be punctuated

Canis per flumen carnem dum ferret, natans
lympharum in speculo uidit simulacrum suum.

For *natans* of the swimming image see Statius Theb. 2. 42 'ingens medio *natat umbra profundo*'. The illustrator of the Fables of the Ademar Paraphrast (no. vii) did not make the mistake. See the reproduction in Thiele's edition, Der illustrierte Aesop in der Handschrift des Ademar, plate II and pages 25, 42 of the letterpress. None of the other Paraphrasts make the dog swim, but, as it would seem, cross by a bridge.

In the Fable of the Panther and the Countrymen, III 2, we read in our current texts that, when the beast was caught in the pit,

alii fustes congerunt,
alii onerant saxis; quidam contra miseriti,
periturae quippe quamvis nemo laederet, 5
misere panem ut sustineret spiritum.

The Latinity of this, the reading of the Pithoeanus and the lost Remensis, if, as seems unavoidable, it has to be understood,

not in the sense of *quamquam nemo laedebatur* (-*eret*) but in that of *etiamsi nemo laesurus esset*, is more than questionable; this however is not my present concern. But what a reason for compassion! ‘Some pitied the beast because it would die—in any case’! And yet we have two clues to the true and the simple sense; first, that of the author in the last line of the fable where the Panther says ‘I return to punish those who have *injured me*’ (“qui *me laeserunt*”), and, secondly, the evidence of the ‘Paraphrasts’¹ who agree in a clear testimony to something very unlike what P and R present ‘parcite *innocenti quae neminem laesit*’. This has been noted by L. Mueller, who proposed ‘cum laesisset neminem,’ and by Riese, whose remedy was ‘neminem quae laeserit’. The fatal objection to both is that they pay no regard to P R whose reading should not merely be rejected but accounted for. The indirect witness has given us the sense, and the direct must help us to the words. Of the three words that compose the phrase, two, *quamvis* and *laederet*, are in themselves unexceptionable. The offending *nemo* is left. If it goes, as it must, there are only two words that can be put in its place, *nullum* and *nullos*, both equally near to the easy corruption *nullus*, for which *nemo* is simply a substitute.

Just exception is taken to anything which, like the *nemo* in the passage last considered, injures the purpose of the story. This does not apply to the carnivorous cow and her companions in I 5, animals that, if they could, would have been as summarily removed as was the vegetarian fox of Horace, Ep. I 7. 29, by Bentley. Critics, as I have observed elsewhere², are prone to confuse these creatures of Fable with their congeners in common life. If we do not trouble about their talking, why should we be particular about their eating? They are not beings but types of character, as indeed Phaedrus himself indicates here ‘*patiens ouis iniuria*’ v. 3. Had Phaedrus thought it was necessary to apologize for providing his domestic beasts with the appetites which would make them hunt with a lion, his answer to an objector would no doubt have been ‘*fictis meminerit nos iocari fabulis*’ I prol. 7.

¹ On the importance of the indications in these mediaeval collections to the student of the text of Phaedrus I may refer to my recent articles in Classical Philology, XIII 262 sqq. and the Classical Quarterly, XII 89 sqq.

² Classical Quarterly, VIII (1914), 240 f.

The trouble is different at I 2. 16 where both fact and expression have been imperfectly understood. The Frogs pray to Jupiter for a King; and in response a small log is dropped from heaven. Its fall and splash upon the marsh put the timid inhabitants in a fright:

paruum tigillum missum quod subito uadi
motu sonoque terruit pauidum genus. 15

Phaedrus proceeds :

hoc mersum limo cum iaceret diutius,
forte una tacite profert e stagno caput
et explorato rege cunctas euocat.
illae timore posito certatim adnatant
lignumque supra turba petulans insilit. 20

So unnatural is it to refer *hoc—iaceret* (for which *lateret* has indeed been conjectured) to the *pauidum genus* instead of the *paruum tigillum* that those who do so cannot have grasped the situation or the meaning of *mersum*. Carried by the momentum of its fall from the sky the log has plunged into the mud below the shallow pools. There it ‘lies’; but it is not ‘buried’ therein. Its upper parts show above the surface, in view of the frog that first thrusts its head above the water and exposed to the invasion and insults of it and its companions. That ‘plunging’ is a legitimate rendering of *mergere* may be seen e. g. from Ovid Met. 3. 249 ‘mersisque in corpore rostris’ of the dogs that thrust their fangs into Actaeon.

In III 7 a slur upon the poet’s character as a stylist has been removed by M. Havet who, on the evidence furnished by the Paraphrasts (cf. Thiele, Der lateinische Äsop des Romulus, No. LXV), has transferred lines 21–24, a meaningless interruption where they are found in the MSS, to their proper position after 10. It is true that Thiele, ib., p. xxxix, refuses to accept the transposition: “Die beiden Anstösse sind im Phädrus nicht etwa durch Umstellung zu tilgen, sondern da man weiss, dass er ungelcken erzählt, zu belassen”; but Thiele’s prejudice against the author, apparent in every part of his work, leads him to acquiesce in any blemish of the text.

About IV 13. 7, where however the text has not to my knowledge hitherto been suspected, I do not feel altogether sure. The Lion who has now ‘made himself King over the Beasts’

and is ambitious to be thought a clement ruler abandons his previous habits.

atque inter illas *tenui* contentus *cibo*
sancta incorrupta iura reddebat fide.

The change in the Lion's diet is ill expressed by '*tenui* *cibo*'. For what is meant is that he had been a flesh-eater, not that he had been a glutton or gourmet¹. This was understood by the Weissenburg Paraphrast: 'contentus *sine sanguine* cibum' i. e. 'cibo.' Similarly other paraphrases "renuntians prioribus factis et mutauit consuetudinem 'pecus ullum se non laedere, sine sanguine cibum sumere'" "nec uoluit sanguineam praedam sequi" (Thiele, No. LXX, pp. 236 f.). It is clear also from the sequel of the fable, which has been lost in Phaedrus but can be gathered from the versions of the Paraphrasts (Thiele l. c., Hervieux II, pp. 149, 188, 223), where the Ape falls a victim when the Lion relapses into his old carnivorous habits. A more suitable epithet is that used by Ovid, Met. 15. 478, where in contradistinction to animal food a vegetarian diet is called 'alimenta *mitia*', that is, 'gentle' or 'humane'. Phaedrus then may well have written *miti* here. But I feel no assurance that he did.

In the whole of Phaedrus there is perhaps no more genuine product of Fable-land than the judgment of the Ape in the case of the Wolf and the Fox I 10

uterque causam cum perorassent suam,
dixisse fertur simius sententiam
'tu non uideris perdidisse quod petis;
te credo surripuisse quod pulcre negas'.

'Liars both! Plaintiff nonsuited and defendant condemned!' Thus the Gilbertian judge; and no doubt there was 'applause and laughter in court'. But this jester's variation on 'not proven' has been too much for some critics of Phaedrus who desiderate a more serious treatment of logic and law, such as might have been expected from the Ape as he was conceived by Romulus the Paraphrast, IV 10, Thiele, Der lateinische Aesop,

¹ Cic. Tusc. Disp. III 49 'Epicurus . . . tenuem uictum antefert copioso' a passage cited by Thiele, op. cit., p. 239, who notes the discrepancy between the text of Phaedrus and the tradition of the Paraphrasts.

No. XLVIII, p. 146 'nudant fraudes suas et uera sibi dicunt mutuo crimina. tunc *iustus et uerax iudex iudicauit inter partes eorum et de libello sententiam legit.* tu, inquit, quaeris quod non perdidisti et te tamen credo *aliquid surripuisse* quod bene negas in iudicio. talis sit abolitio uestra et pares exite concordes'. That there was a strong vein of humour in the composition of Phaedrus we are justified in concluding from the apologetics of the *mulier parturiens* I 18 and the *calvus et musca* V 3 with others besides.

Of the popular and easy-going modes of thinking congenial to the Fable we find examples elsewhere. In IV 22. 27 where Simonides is drawing a moral from the destitute condition of his fellow-passengers

'dixi' inquit 'mea
mecum esse cuncta; vos quod *rapuistis* perit'.

I should myself have preferred Bentley's *habuistis* as providing a better contrast to *mea*. But I do not doubt that in *rapuistis* Simonides is glancing at the hasty gathering of their treasures by the passengers when the vessel sank (11).

Conversely in V 4. 9

sed dices 'qui *rapuere* diuitias *habent*'.
numeremus agendum qui *depreensi* perierunt;
maiores turbam punitorum reperies,
paucis temeritas est bono, multis malo

it has been proposed to expel *habent* in favour of *latent*¹ or some less plausible substitute, the reason being that *habent* does not furnish a proper antithesis to *depreensi perierunt*. This is mere caprice. Verb and tense express that those who have clutched at riches 'still keep' their ill-gotten gains. So much is stated, and the rest is implied.

Two passages of V 5, the Ventiloquist and the Rustic, have been reprehended on grounds that I must think inadequate. In 11, 12 we read

dispersus rumor ciuitatem concitat
paulo ante *sacra* turbam deficiunt *loca*

which means that in the theatre that a while ago had been empty there was now no room for the crowd. The sense of *loca*

¹ Bentley altered *rapuere* to *latuere*.

with the adjective and with the verb is not absolutely the same; but the slight shift of meaning is very natural and would certainly not have been noticed by a Roman.

In 29 ff.

tunc simulans sese uestimentis rusticus
porcellum obtegere (quod faciebat scilicet
sed in priore quia nil compererant latens)
peruellit aurem uero quem celauerat

simulans has been censured because the pig was really there and so there was no 'pretence'. This is running language very hard. Why should not the participle mean 'trying', that is *affecting*, 'to pretend'?

At IV 19. 6

hanc alia cum rogaret causam facinoris
respondit 'Ne quis discat prodesse improbis'

the real meaning of this impudently cynical defence of ingratitude appears to be 'That *all* should learn *not* to help the wicked'. Its illogical form belongs to popular and colloquial speech, which is apt to get confused where negatives are involved. *discat* has thus crept into the place of *uelit* or the like; and we have a mixture belonging to the same class as Livy's phrase 3. 41. 9 '*minus* in bono *constans* quam nauum in malitia *ingenium*' for which '*magis* in bono *non constans*' would have been expected.

One of the forms which the curtness of Phaedrus takes is the use of a word without the expected qualifier, a feature which we often find in Silver Latin writers. A simple example is II 8. 21 'quia *corruptos* uiderat nuper boues' which the Paraphrasts who give *macilentos* rightly understand as 'macie *corruptos*' (the phrase of Caesar B. C. 3. 58. 5). The employment of *genus* for 'class of composition', 'branch of letters' in II 1. 1 'Exemplis continetur Aesopi *genus*' has provoked a number of emendations though it only carries the use of IV prol. 13 'usus uetusto *genere* sed rebus nouis' a short step further.

It is an interesting question whether curtness or inconsistency is to be seen in App. 15. 10 where Aesop affords a warning on

the danger of speaking the truth. His mistress is enraged at his plainspeaking on the subject of her charms

et *obiurgari iussit seruum garrulum,*

a castigation to which Aesop refers at the end of the piece

‘*flagris sum caesus, uerum quia dixi modo’.*

Now it is true that elsewhere *obiurgare*, when used of physical correction, takes an ablative of the instrument and hence *seruum* is usually amended to *ferula* or *ferulis*. If however the qualifier may be suppressed, *seruum* may be retained with a very good sense “ordered him to be ‘rebuked’ as a talkative slave”, that is, for forgetting his position. Both *ferulis* (Suetonius Cal. 20) and *flagris* (id. Otho 2) are found with *obiurgari*; but they did not mean the same, as ‘the freedman of Augustus’ would be well aware. If then the slave who had been admonished with a cane said he had been cut with a lash, this must be regarded as intentional exaggeration.

Misconception of the uses of *uirgo* has caused trouble in the Ephesian tale of the Widow and the Soldier, App. 13. In 5 for

claram assecuta est famam *castae uirginis*

M. Haret's text gives *casto uiduio*. Mr. L. Rank, Mnemosyne 40. 53, proposes *casta uiduitas*. But *uirgo* often means no more than a ‘young woman’, whether married or single. In Verg. Buc. 6. 46, 52 ‘infelix uirgo’ is addressed to the wife of Minos and the mother of the Minotaur and Silius's application of it to Pyrene in 3. 420 ff. may serve to show that there was nothing peculiar in the use: ‘nomen Bebrycia duxere a *uirgine* colles, | hospitis Alcidae crimen qui . . . | lugendam formae *sine uirginitate* reliquit | Pyrenen’ and after this ‘laceros Tirynthius artus, | dum remeat uictor, lacrimis perfudit et amens | palluit inuento dilectae *uirginis* ore’. So far from touching *uirgo* in v. 5 we should do well to restore it to Phaedrus in v. 28.

at sancta *mulier* ‘non est quod timeas’ ait
uirque corpus tradit figendum cruci

following at once upon

turbatus miles factum exponit *mulieri*

has very properly been questioned. ‘sancta *uidua*’, the received correction, gives a collocation of words that Phaedrus might certainly have used though there is nothing to show that he would. ‘sancta *virgo*’ is however a preferable substitute. It would carry a sting in its double entente that would be at once appropriate to the situation and characteristic of the author, the ‘improbi Phaedri’ of Martial. Compare the song that the mad Ophelia sings: ‘Let in the *maid* that out a *maid* | Never departed more’. It was however an expression that our Cardinal-editor would for a very obvious reason remove as profane.¹

Sometimes the offence is that the word employed is not as apt as we could wish; but in a language so poor in synonyms as Latin this should not count for so very much. In III 8. 14 sqq.

‘Cotidie’ inquit ‘speculo uos uti uolo,
tu formam ne corrumpas nequitiae malis,
tu faciem ut istam moribus *uincas bonis*’,

both *malis* and *uincas* have been challenged and more expressive words sought for. *malis*, for which Scheffer would actually substitute *mac(u)lis*, is defended by the metre and the correspondence of *bonis*. For *uincas* Bentley proposed *penses* and Triller *pingas*, accepted by M. Havet. But *uincas* is not more than legitimately vague and ‘to defeat your (unlovely) face’ may well be understood of nullifying or neutralizing its unloveliness. Elsewhere in Latin poets we find *uincere* used where we expect a more distinctive word, as in Tibullus I 8. 55 ‘poterat custodia *uinci*’ where *decipi* is meant and Propertius IV 6. 68 ‘una decem *uicit missa sagitta rates*’ (‘put out of action’, we might say).

pati is used in a similar way and would certainly have been attacked in III epil. 26 ‘decerne quod religio, quod *patitur fides* | et gratulari me fac iudicio tuo’ if any convenient verb with a more positive signification could have been found. But here again Phaedrus does not stand alone. Compare Lucan 4. 352

¹ What he would take upon himself to do in the interests of religious decorum may be seen from III 10. 39, where ‘a *divo* Augusto tunc petiere iudices’ is transformed into ‘pontificem maximum rogarunt’.

'tradimus Hesperias gentes, aperimus Eoas | securumque orbis
patimur post terga reicti', 9. 365 'abstulit arboribus pretium
nemorique laborem | Alcides *passusque inopes* sine pondere
ramos | rettulit Argolico fulgentia poma tyranno'. To say a
man 'permits' a direct effect of his own action, strikes us not
unnaturally as odd.

cogere in V 5. 34 sq.

adclamat populus scurram multo similius
imitatum et *cogit* rusticum trudi foras

does not mean 'force' but 'would force', 'insists'. It is
obvious that the rustic was not ejected after the dénouement.
The passage should have been cited in the Thesaurus s. u. in
connection with Propertius I 4. 2 and III 11. 42.

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, May 16, 1918.

IV.—THE ‘THOUGHT’ MOTIF OF WISDOM VERSUS FOLLY IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

In a recent paper¹ Professor Knapp calls attention, with detailed analysis, to a recurrent *φρήν* or *φρονεῖν* motif in the Antigone of Sophocles. The author affirms that a consideration of this motif in the play will show that Sophocles meant to represent Antigone as wholly sinless and Creon as completely in the wrong; furthermore, that a subtitle to the play might well be *Φρόνημα* vs. *Ἀφροσύνη*, Right Thinking versus Wrong Thinking, Wisdom versus Folly, or, True Wisdom is it to obey God rather than Man. At the conclusion of the paper there is this foot-note: ‘Some reader may ask whether such a recurrent motif can be found in any other Greek play. To my mind it matters little or nothing whether one can or can not be found’.

Professor Knapp’s paper is interesting and excellently presented. Certainly, as he points out, the Antigone fairly bristles with variations of this ‘Think’, ‘Think’ motif. It is, I think, unquestionably true that by emphasizing this note the poet assists us to a complete realization of the foolish Wrong Thinking of the stubborn and narrow-minded Creon and the sublime True Wisdom of the pious and martyred Antigone.²

¹A. J. P. 37, 300–315. < Cf. A. J. P. 38, 337.—B. L. G. >

²The writer sees peculiar import where little or none exists, in my opinion, in the following lines: 169, 298, 762, 767, 768.

I do not agree with Professor Knapp in his assertion of the significance of lines 388 ff. He adds: “Not even so keen a critic as Jebb noticed that in these words of the Guard (‘O King, naught is there against which man should take his oath, for after-thought belies his first intent’) Sophocles forestalled (summed up) the outcome of the play”. I do not believe that the poet consciously or purposely has the Guard prognosticate the *dénouement* of the play with Creon’s downfall. The Guard merely refers to his own experience: ‘I vowed I should not be here again,—yet here I am’. But he prefaces his statement with a gnomic utterance (characteristic of his kind in Greek tragedy) showing that, after all, his own experience perhaps is but that of all mankind. *βροτοῖσιν οὐδέτερ’ ἔστιν ἀπάντων*, which *sententia* had previously been affirmed by Archilochus, fr. 76.

The peculiar significance of the occurrence of this motif, however, may be over-emphasized. In any portrayal of a clash of wills or purposes is it not natural, even inevitable, that this issue of Wisdom versus Folly (together with their concomitant attributes) be dwelt upon¹? And in Greek tragedy is this not a fundamental religious tenet, that 'True Wisdom is it to obey God rather than Man'? If so, we should expect to find this motif of the *Antigone* of frequent occurrence in other Greek tragedies. And, as a matter of fact, it is often found. For the purpose of illustration I shall take the *Electra* and the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles and the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus.

Let us consider first the *Electra*, and in particular the scenes between the sisters Electra and Chrysothemis in which the motif is of especial frequency. This is likewise the case in the *Antigone* in the dialogue between the sisters, Antigone and Ismene, where this note is much in evidence. The situations in the two plays are, to be sure, very similar. In both cases the stronger and more determined sister strives to win over the weaker to participation in a hazardous, although righteous, deed of daring. To the weaker sister, Ismene, Antigone's proposal to bury the corpse of Polyneices contrary to the edict of the king is, indeed, Folly, while to Chrysothemis, Electra's stern resolve herself to slay Aegisthus seems Unwisdom which wellnigh approaches insanity.²

¹ See end of paper for elaboration of this point.

² And yet there is no doubt that the poet intended us to see and believe that Electra was in the right so far as the moral issue is concerned. Chrysothemis herself admits the piety of the proposed deed, and the justification for it, but excuses herself from active participation in it because of her timid nature. Cf. 332 ff., especially 338: 'Nevertheless *right* is on the side of thy choice, not of that which I advise'. With this, Ismene's similar excuse when she refuses aid to her sister is to be compared: 'I, asking the Spirits Infernal to pardon, seeing that force is put on me herein (*ὅς βιάζομαι τάδε*), will hearken to our rulers'.

Likewise in the *Antigone* the poet unquestionably means us to feel the moral righteousness of the heroine's cause. This is not to say, however, that it is possible, or even tolerable, according to the Greek conception, for any hero of Greek tragedy to be *wholly* in the right or *wholly* in the wrong in respect to *all* their impulses and acts. This last question inevitably suggests the well-known passage in the *Poetics*

A brief statement (for lengthy discussion is not needed) of the pertinent lines in the Electra in which the motif is bandied back and forth follows. Chrysothemis dilates (328-340) on the necessity for prudence, which she herself observes, but which is disregarded by her foolish sister. Electra scornfully

(1453a) and the meaning of *ἀμαρτία* in Aristotle's definition of the tragic hero where he says: "A thoroughly good and just man (*έπιεικής*) must not be seen passing from happiness to misery; this is not fear-inspiring or piteous, but simply odious (*μαρῷ*) to us. Nor, on the other hand, should an extremely bad man be seen falling from happiness into misery; such a story may arouse the human feeling in us, but it will not arouse us to either pity or fear. There remains the intermediate kind of personage, a person *not preeminently virtuous and just*, whose misfortune, however, is brought upon him not by vice and depravity but δι' *ἀμαρτίαν τινά*".

The study of the character and conduct of heroes in Greek tragedy and Aristotle's own characterization of the tragic hero, διὰ μέρες ἀμερτίαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην, influence me to concur with Butcher in his interpretation of *ἀμαρτία* (pp. 317 ff.: "*Ἀμαρτία* is an elastic term not to be delimited precisely. It refers to a single great error, whether morally culpable or not") and to disagree with Bywater (note in ed. of Poetics, p. 215) and his supporter, van Braam (Clas. Quart. 1912). Bywater says: "It is strange that the *ἀμαρτία* of which Aristotle is speaking, should have been taken by Tumlirz and others to mean not an error of judgement, but some ethical fault or infirmity of character. The Sophoclean Oedipus is a man of hasty temper but his *ἀμαρτία* was not in that, but in the 'great mistake' he made, when he became unwittingly the slayer of his own father". But Oedipus slew his father in sudden and bitter anger as he himself tells the story (O. T. 807).¹ This impetuous impulsiveness of the hero, which at times approaches folly, is in evidence throughout the play (as is shown later in this paper) and it is this same blind impulsiveness which leads him to put out his own eyes.

Now in what respect is Antigone not altogether *έπιεικής*, and what is the 'error', or 'shortcoming', or 'tragic flaw' of the heroine, in the Aristotelian sense, which prevents the spectator from regarding her unhappy fate as *intolerably μαρῷ* (revolting or offensive)? The flaw is imprudence in the extreme and rashness which, although admirably heroic, leads her not only to the bold accomplishment of the legally forbidden, though pious act, but even influences her to commit suicide. As the Chorus says (875): "Thy self-willed temper hath wrought thy ruin". Even Jebb says (Intro. p. xxii): "Sophocles has been content to make Antigone merely a nobly heroic woman, not a being exempt from human passion and human weakness". Furthermore, from the Greek view-point, in his discussion of the *ethos* of the Agents, Aristotle affirms (1454a): "The Agent must be true to type. There is, for

¹ Hardly an unbiased interpretation of the passage.—C. W. E. M.

brands such prudence as cowardice (341 ff.),¹ 'Then take thy choice, to be imprudent (*φρονεῖν κακῶς*) ; or prudent (*φρονοῦσα*), but forgetful of thy friends. I covet not such privilege as thine,—nor wouldest thou, wert thou wise (*σώφρων γ' οὖσα*)'. Chr. prophesies dread punishment for Electra: 'Do not blame me hereafter, when the blow hath fallen, now is the time & καλῷ φρονεῖν'. El. prays that the blow may fall quickly. Chr. protests (390): 'Where are thy wits (*ποῦ ποτ' εἰ φρενῶν;*) ?'² El. complains of her unhappy life. Chr. replies (394) that it might be happy if El. could only learn to be prudent (*εὖ φρονεῖν*) and adds (398): 'Tis well not to fall by folly (*& διβουλίας*)'. Chr. (402): 'Wilt thou not take my counsel?' El. (403) 'No, verily, long may it be before I am so foolish (*νοῦ κενῆ*)'.³ Again Chr. implores (429): 'Hearken to me, and be not ruined by folly (*διβουλίᾳ πεσεῖν*) !'⁴ El. urges Chr.

example, a type of manly valor; but it is not appropriate in a female Agent to be manly (*ἀνδρεῖα*)". It is to be noted that throughout the play, Antigone is rebuked for this culpable rashness (for her 'hot heart for chilling deeds') which makes her indifferent to all consequences, and for being swayed by manly, valorous impulses. Note especially in Ismene's speech in the very beginning of the play (61-64): "Nay, we must remember, first, that we were born women, as who should not strive with men; next, that we are ruled of the stronger, so that we must obey in these things, and in things yet sorer". Further, in a series of passages Creon emphasizes the odium of Antigone's assumption of masculinity and that it is unthinkable that he, a man and a king, should be disobeyed and worsted by a woman; cf. 484-5; 525; 579; 678-80.

I do not wish to be misunderstood as saying that Antigone, because of her impetuous rashness, and Oedipus, impulsive and prone to gusts of wrath, actually deserved the awful doom that fell upon them. As Butcher says (p. 309): "Nothing but a misplaced ingenuity, or a resolve at all costs to import a moral lesson into the drama can discover in Antigone any fault or failing which entailed on her suffering as its due penalty". But the fact remains that from the Aristotelian viewpoint Antigone, Oedipus, Prometheus, and Agamemnon are not entirely ἐπιεικεῖς. They have frailties which are human like our own; hence they are 'sympathetic characters' and θλεος καὶ φόβος are aroused in the audience which witnesses their misfortunes. On the tragic ἀμάρτια, see Cooper, ed. of the Poetics, p. 41, for an excellent note.

¹ Trans. of Soph. are, in part, by Jebb.

² Cf. Ism. to Ant. (42): *ποῦ γνώμης ποτ' εἰ;*

³ Cf. Ism. to Ant. (68).

⁴ Cf. Ant. to Ism. (95): 'But leave me and my folly (*δινεβουλίαν*)'.

at least not to place Clytaemnestra's offerings on Agamemnon's tomb and the Chorus concludes this scene with the injunction to Chr. to obey El. in this, 'εἰ σωφροῦσθεις'.¹

Later in the play, after the news of Orestes' fictitious death has been reported, Electra again importunes Chrysothemis for help in the slaying of Aegisthus. In this scene (following the request in 990-1057) the motif recurs again and again. The key-note is struck by the Chorus (990) urging forethought (*προηγθία*). Chr. assents (993): 'Yea, and before she spoke, were she blest with a sound mind (*φρενῶν μὴ κακῶν*) she would have remembered caution'. 'Do thou learn prudence (*νοῦ σχέσις*)'. Again the Chorus side with Chr. warning El. thus (1015-16): 'Hearken, there is no better gain for mortals to win than foresight (*προνότας*) and *νοῦ σοφοῦ*'. El. to Chr. (1027): 'I admire thy prudence (*νοῦ νοῦ*); thy cowardice I hate'. Chr. (1036): 'I am thinking for thy good (*προηγθίας δὲ σοῦ*)'. El. 'Must I follow thy rule of right'? Chr. (1038): 'When thou art wise (*εὖ φρονής*), then thou shalt be our guide'. El. (1047): 'Nothing is more hateful than bad counsel'. Chr.: 'Thou seemest to agree (*φρονεῖν*) with nothing that I urge'. And finally in the concluding lines of this scene: El. (1052): 'Nay, go within, never will I follow thee. It were great folly (*πολλῆς ἀνοίας*) even to attempt an idle quest'.² Chr. (1055): 'Nay, if thou art wise (*φρονῶν*) in thine own eyes, be such wisdom thine (*φρόνει τοιαῦθ'*)'.

Let us now turn to the Oedipus Tyrannus. In this powerful and profoundly impressive drama the hero, Oedipus, attains to the full revelation of his unhappy situation and meets with the fulfilment of his doom not merely as a helpless victim of Fate but through the agency of his own impetuous Folly, stubborn Self-will and Wrong Thinking. This infirmity of an essentially noble mind is repeatedly harped upon, first by the soothsayer Teiresias, and later by Creon.

Early in the play Teiresias, summoned by Oedipus, and bidden to reveal the slayer of Laius, exclaims (316) with deep feeling: 'Alas, how dreadful to have Wisdom (*φρονεῖν*) where it profits not the Wise (*φρονούστι*)'! Contrasted with the absolute wisdom of Teiresias, who is the mouth-piece of God, is

¹ For the τὸ φρονεῖν motif in Clyt. speech to El., see lines 529 and 550.

² Cf. Ant. 68: τὸ γὰρ περισσά τράσσειν οὐκ ἔχει νοῦσον οὐδέποτε.

the folly of ignorance of Oedipus which is shortly to be completely revealed.¹ When Teiresias refuses to divulge the identity of the culprit, Oedipus implores (326) : 'For the love of the gods, turn not away, if thou hast knowledge ($\phi\tauον\omegaν$ γε) : all we suppliants implore thee on our knees'. Whereupon Teiresias retorts (328) : 'Aye, πάντες γὰρ οὐ φρονεῖτ'. In this phrase, οὐ φρονεῖτ, there is double meaning, I think. Not merely does Teiresias refer to the ignorance of Oedipus and the other suppliants as to the real situation, but especially does he rebuke the unwisdom of Oedipus in seeking to probe the matter.

Creon, having learned of the serious charges brought against him, seeks Oedipus, with upbraiding. Oedipus, exasperated, exclaims (548) : 'Explain me not one thing—that thou art not false'. To this Creon replies (549) : 'If thou deemest that stubborn self-will without sense ($\tauὴν αὐθαδίαν$. . . τοῦ νοῦ χωρίς) is a good gift, thou art not wise ($οὐκ ὁρθῶς φρονεῖς$)'.²

A further contrast between Creon's conservative and judicial temperament³ and Oedipus' impulsiveness is revealed by Creon's significant line (569) : 'Where I lack light ($\epsilon\phi'$ οὐς γὰρ μὴ φρονῶ), 'tis my wont to be silent'. We may compare also line 589 where Creon affirms that, in the circumstances, he has no yearning to be king, nor 'hath any man who knows how to keep a sober mind ($\sigmaωφρονεῖν$)'; likewise line 600 of Creon's defence: 'No mind will become false, if it is wise ($\kappaλῶς φρονῶν$)'. Oedipus' infirmity is further emphasized by the gnomic warning of the Chorus (616) : 'The quick in counsel ($\phi\tauον\epsilonν$ οἱ ταχεῖς) are not sure'. Compare also 626, where Creon finally accuses Oedipus of lack of sanity ($οὐ γὰρ φρονοῦντά σ' εὖ βλέπω$); and 649, when the Chorus begs Oedi-

¹ Just as the folly and doom of Oedipus are early presaged in the tragedy by the hero's clash with the unerring soothsayer and by the latter's pronouncement so in the Ant. that Creon is to be regarded as clearly in the wrong is evidenced in the clash with Teiresias.

² For $\alphaὐθαδία$ the key-word of Aesch. *Prom.* see below.

³ Cf. Oedipus' *tu quoque* (552), οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖ.

'Admirable is Jebb's characterization of Creon (Intro. to O. T. xxix), especially felicitous in the light of the present: "It might be said that the Creon of the O. T. embodies a good type of Scottish character, as the Creon of the Ant.—an earlier sketch—is rather of the Prussian type".

pus to come to a sound mind (*πιθοῦ θελήσας φρονήσας τ' ἀναξ, λίσσομαι*), and Creon, grudgingly forgiven, departs with the weighty words: 'I will go my way; thee have I found undiscerning (*πορεύσομαι, σοῦ μὲν τυχὼν ἀγνώτος*).

In the Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus the motif of Folly versus Wisdom, or, in particular, True Wisdom is it to obey God rather than Man, is dominant throughout.¹ This note is struck in the opening lines when the implacable Kratos exultingly pronounces the doom of Prometheus in that the latter must pay the penalty for his disobedience to God for the theft of fire for man. Further, in 85-86:

*ψευδωνύμως σε δαίμονες προμηθέα
καλοῦσι· αὐτὸν γάρ σε δει προμηθέως.*

The wisdom which underlies obedience and, on the contrary, the wages of a sinful tongue (321) are insisted upon by Oceanus (337), who thus admonishes Prometheus: 'Far better by nature art thou to give sensible advice (*φρενοῦν*) to thy neighbor than to thyself' and exhorts him to repent and give heed (380): 'For words are the physicians of a mood distempered (*ὅργης νοσούσης*)'. The obdurate Prometheus, however, characterizes (383) Oceanus' proposed intervention as light-witted folly (*κουφόνουν εὐηθίαν*). Oceanus ironically retorts: 'Suffer me to be sick with this sickness (*τῇ νόσῳ νοσεῖν*)² since 'tis best to be wise while seeming the contrary (*εὖ φρονῶντα μὴ φρονεῖν δοκεῖν*).

The key-word of the play of the Prometheus is *αἴθαδία*, i. e., stubborn, self-willed folly.³ The term characterizes that besetting sin of Prometheus which spurred him on to wilful dis-

¹ This was not recognized, of course, when it was not known or realized that the P. V. is but one play in a Prometheus trilogy. Then Prom. was naturally regarded as a wise and innocent victim, and Zeus as an ungrateful and heartless tyrant, a conception wholly false to Aesch. religious orthodoxy.

² Cf. Ant. 1050-52:

Τει. δούφ κράτιστον κτημάτων εὐβουλία;

Cr. δούφερ, οἷμα, μὴ φρονεῖν πλείστη βλάβη.

Τει. ταύτης σὺ μέντοι τῆς νόσου πλήρης δόρυ.

³ Cf. Prom. 64, 79, 436, 907, 964, 1012, 1034. *αἴθαδία* is likewise a characteristic of Medea; cf. Eur. Med. 28-9, 38, 223, 621. Cf. also Ant. 1028.

obedience and bold defiance of Zeus, and which finally brought upon him, as arch-rebel, humiliating and awful punishment. That he is influenced by such a fault is denied by Prometheus (436) and, in fact, in that magnificent speech of defiance against Zeus (907-927) he accuses the *τίραννος θεῶν* of being *αὐθαδη φρονῶν* (907).

It is in the dialogue with Hermes that Prometheus is repeatedly censured for his *αὐθαδία* which is opposed to *εὐβουλία*. Thus, in lines 964-5, Hermes admonishes him: 'Truly it was by just such wilful folly (*αὐθαδίσμασιν*) before that thou didst moor thyself to this misfortune'. Again (1000), addressing Prometheus, Hermes exclaims: 'Take heart, O foolish one (*μάταιε*), take heart at last in view of these calamities to think aright (*όρθως φρονεῖν*)'. For (1012-13) *αὐθαδία* in one that thinks not aright (*φρονοῦντι μὴ καλῶς*) itself by itself has greater strength than naught'. Likewise (1034-5): 'Never think, Prometheus, *αὐθαδία* is better than *εὐβουλία*'. In these 'minatory and monitory' injunctions of Hermes the Chorus concurs (1036-9): 'In our opinion Hermes gives timely counsel; for he bids thee abandon thy *αὐθαδία* and seek wise *εὐβουλία*. O yield! It is disgraceful for the wise to err'. Already had the Chorus in a beautiful and pious prayer (542-4) pointed out Prometheus' infirmity (i. e., *αὐθαδία*) although in different language: 'For in thy self-will (Folly) *ἴδιᾳ γνώμῃ*, thou honorest mortals o'er much, Prometheus'.

Does not the examination to which we have subjected these three plays reveal the frequency and purpose of this motif as employed by the Greek dramatists? Its exact significance (where it occurs) is determined by the exigency of plot, character, or situation. Thus, *τὸ φρονεῖν* and its variants, in the Electra generally have reference to prudence and caution; in the Oedipus Tyrannus, to wisdom; in the Prometheus, to obedience to God. It is true that in the Antigone the motif occurs most frequently, now in one sense, now in another. But this is what one might expect in a play where there is contention and clashing of wills and purposes throughout: first, between Antigone and Ismene; secondly, between Antigone and Creon; thirdly, between Creon and Haemon; and fourthly, between Creon and Teiresias.

Finally, in our consideration of this aspect of our subject,

Aristotle (*Poetics*, 1450a and b) is of service in his analysis of tragedy and its formative or constitutive elements. "The first essential", he says, "is Plot; second, the Characters; third, the element of *Thought* (ἢ διάνοια), i. e., the power of the Agent to say whatever can be said (τὰ ἐνόρα) or whatever is appropriate to the occasion (τὰ ἀρμόττοντα). Thought is shown in all the Agents say when proving or disproving some particular point, or enunciating some universal proposition. It is that element in the speeches of a drama which is supplied by the study of *Politics* and the art of *Rhetoric*". As Bywater says (edit. p. 172) the Agents in a Greek tragedy are personages of importance, great position and lineage; they naturally speak πολιτικῶς (like statesmen), i. e., they show a statesman-like power of saying what is appropriate to the situation before them. They speak also ρήτορικῶς (like rhetors) with something of the rhetor's cleverness in seizing on the various possible points that may be urged on the occasion.

In critical scenes in Greek tragedy in which Agents engage in keen debate or controversy we should expect to find, therefore, as we do find, Aristotle's element of Thought, elaborated and emphasized by what we may designate as the 'Thought' motif; Wisdom versus Folly. Each Agent presents his arguments and defends his position πολιτικῶς καὶ ρήτορικῶς to the best of his ability, so as to show his own Right Thinking and Wisdom and the Wrong Thinking and Folly of his opponent.

LARUE VAN HOOK.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

V.—ON AENEAS TACTICUS.

The following brief notes are made to the text of R. Schöne, Leipzig, 1911, giving in addition to chapter and paragraph the reference by lines.

6, 6, l. 215: *συναγείρειν* for *συνημέρειν* of M gives the sense desired and is closer to the tradition than the other emendations suggested.

15, 1, l. 525: *δν πι ἀγγελθὲν ή πυρσενθῆ* M. May not Aeneas have used a periphrastic form *ἀγγελθὲν η?* If so, one of the eta's might easily have dropped out.

18, 1, l. 718: *περὶ πέρτας βαλάνους* M, with a space of five letters, indicating a lacuna, just preceding. Read *καὶ γὰρ περὶ τὰς βαλάνους*. The emphatic connective is appropriate because of the extreme importance which Aeneas attaches to the topic which he here begins to discuss at great length. For *καὶ γάρ* compare 23, 2, l. 1015.

21, 1, l. 851: *καὶ εἰ τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὡς δεῖ ἀφανίζειν* M. For *εἰ* (which is lost in M) B reads *η*. Delete *εἰ*, which looks like the remnant of a variant that ran *εἰ τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ δεῖ ἀφανίζειν κτλ.* (omitting *ὡς*).

21, 2, ll. 856 ff.: *τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ἐν τῇ Στρατοπεδευτικῇ βίβλῳ γραπτέον ὃν τρόπον δεῖ γενέσθαι, ὀδίγα δὲ αὐτόν καὶ νῦν δηλώσομεν.* It seems clear, from the form of expression used here, that the *Στρατοπεδευτικὴ βίβλος* was fully planned, though not yet published. The present treatise, therefore, falls about in the middle of Aeneas' military treatises. Others not yet published were the *Ναυτικὴ τάξις*, part of the first sentence of which follows the present treatise in M, and probably also the *Τακτικὴ βίβλος*, from which Aelian, 3, 4, quotes Aeneas' definition of tactics. Had the latter work been already published Aeneas could hardly have failed to refer to it, especially in 1, 2, where such a reference would have been most apt.

22, 8, ll. 898 ff. A satisfactory logical connection can be secured here by transposing the clauses *καὶ τοὺς ἡμέρας κτλ.* and *οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτήδειον κτλ.* which are of about the same length.

The whole passage is full of obvious corruptions and a couple of στίχοι or so may have been changed about.

22, 27, l. 992. Delete παρὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ as a gloss upon σημεῖον, reading τὸν στρατηγόν with Köchly and Rüstow in the preceding line.

29, II, l. 1374. For ὄπλα οἰστοιν M (with an indication of corruption over ω) read πλῆθος οἰστοῦ. A very considerable quantity of osiers would be needed to supply material for the defensive armor as well as for all the ordinary objects which they were compelled to manufacture during the daytime in order to avoid suspicion. Hercher had already, with good reason, suspected ὄπλα.

31, 31, ll. 1574 ff. The use of τόδε and the absence of a connective between the two cryptograms make it probable that we have here but a single message. Von Gutschmid saw that the expedition against Dionysius II in 357 B. C. was referred to, and Hermann Schöne's brilliant emendation κόλος for καλός is extremely apt. The whole represents, therefore, a message which Dio, who went on ahead, may actually have sent to Heraclides who followed him with a larger force of ships and men, and with this supposition the form Ἡρακλεῖδας, the very dialectic form which Dio himself would have used, agrees. For the striking appropriateness of just such a message (with Hermann Schöne's emendation) one might compare the words of Eduard Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums, V, 513: "Aber mit vollem Recht rechnete Dion, dass die Macht des Herrschers morsch und von ihm selbst unterwühlt sei." It will be remembered that Dio set out with the preposterously small force of 800 men.¹

38, 5, l. 1775: For παρένται M read περάνεν.

¹ Since the above was set up I have observed that Hermann Diels (Abhandl. d. preuss. Akad., 1913, no. 3 p. 19) and (independently) Herbert Fischer (Quaest. Aeneanae, Dresden, 1914) emend to κακῶς. M's archetype had indeed only ΚΑC, as Diels points out, but κακῶς involves a change even in these letters, while κόλος does not. That the message is from Dionysius, as Diels suggests, is unlikely in view of the fact that Heraclides had been exiled by Dionysius, and on reaching Sicily fought against the tyrant, while he could hardly have been suspected of favoring the cause of Dionysius (which in fact he never openly espoused) until after the defeat of Philistus in 356 B. C., but by that time such a message would have lost its appropriateness.

40, I, 1. 1834: For ἀλλὰ πασιναποι Μ (with indications of corruption over the third and fourth a) read ἄμα (or possibly ἀλλη) παντάπασι.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Aeneas Tacticus 38, 4-5 treats of methods of maintaining the morale of soldiers by judicious praise, appeals, or censure. This last is not to be used in anger (38, 4), and if it be necessary to reprove anyone either for neglect of duty or for disorderly conduct, it should be the wealthy and conspicuous offenders, who are to be selected as more effective warnings. Then follow these words (in Schoene's text): *ἐν οἷς καρδῖς ἔκαστα τούτων δεῖ τιπείναι ἐν τοῖς Ἀκούσμασι γέγραπται.* For the MS reading *τιπείναι* Hercher proposed *τοιεῖν*, Koechly and Rüstow the more likely *τιπαινέιν* (doubtless suggested by 38, 4). Neither of these emendations is considered likely by Schoene himself, who merely obelizes the word. Casaubon, on the other hand, retained it and translated the phrase *quibus... temporibus horum unumquodque debeat usurpari*, thus apparently understanding the word as the present infinitive of *τιπέμι*. But it is, I think, better taken as the second aorist infinitive of *τιπίημι*, in the sense of 'overlook' or 'condone', which well fits the context and to which a good parallel in thought occurs in 26, 8, where Aeneas cautions against excessive endeavors to detect guards sleeping at their posts: *οὐ γὰρ συμφέρει οὕτω διακέιμενον τὸ στράτευμα ἔτι ἀθυμότερον καθιστάναι (εἰκὸς δὲ ὅταν εὑρεθῇ αἰσχρόν τι τοιῶν ἀθυμεῖν), ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πρὸς θεραπείαν τε καὶ ἀνάληψιν αὐτῶν τραπέσθαι.*

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

VI.—ON THE *Kετοῖ* OF JULIUS AFRICANUS.

The excerpts from Aeneas Tacticus in the *Kετοῖ* of Julius Africanus need many emendations if they are to present a readable text. The latest editor, R. Schoene, in the Teubner text of Aeneas, Leipzig, 1911, though adding greatly to our knowledge of the MS tradition of the excerpts, yet follows, properly enough for his purposes, the example of Hercher in furnishing only a *recensio*, thus treating the text of Africanus as a mere family of MSS containing portions of Aeneas, and accordingly important chiefly as an aid in constituting the text of the latter. If, however, one also desires to know what sense Africanus intended to convey by means of these excerpts, it becomes necessary to have recourse to *emendatio* as well. We therefore offer, as an aid to the study of the text of Africanus, the following conjectures, partly our own and partly those of Boivin (in Thevenot's *Vetores Mathematici*, Paris, 1693, pp. 339–360), for Schoene has not quoted quite as many of the very plausible emendations of Boivin as seem necessary to secure a readable text. We here note, of course, only those conjectures which we should ourselves accept in editing the work. Our own were made before Boivin's notes became available to us, and in several instances we discovered that he had anticipated us. The citations are made by chapter and line from Schoene's edition.

Ch. 48, l. 22. Delete τό before κτῆμα.

49, l. 37. Read λανθάνη with Boivin: λανθάνει MSS.

50, l. 70 f. Read καὶ εἰ μὲν μὴ γνωσθεῖεν (εἰ being the reading of the text which lay before Boivin):
καὶ οὐ μὲν μὴ ἐγνώσθη MSS.

50, l. 82. Read τούτους: τούτου MSS.

52, l. 105. Read διαιροῦτα: διαιροῦται MSS.

53, l. 117. Read δεσμὸν with Boivin: δεσμῶν or δεσμῶν
MSS.

53, l. 130. Add δέλτους (from Aeneas) after παραγινομένας.

55, l. 154. Read τοῖς: ἵ MSS.

- 55, l. 155. Read ἐη ἀν οὐν τοῦτο: εἰ οὖν τούτους MSS.
(τοῦτο Boivin).

55, l. 156. Read ἀπάγειν with Boivin: ἀπάγειν MSS.

56a, l. 169 f. Read βουληθῶμεν ἀν, οὔτως ποιήσωμεν: β. οὔτως
ἀν π. MSS.

56a, l. 171. Read γ: ἔστιν MSS.

56a, l. 172. Read ζω: ζω MSS.

56a, l. 173. Delete ως and read η for ή of the MSS.
(η Boivin).

58, l. 201. Add εῑ before τρία with Boivin.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

A. S. PEASE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

VII.—PRAEVARICATIO AND DELIRIUM.

The modern lexicons, Festus, the younger Pliny, and Cicero are not concordant about the precise meaning of *praevericatio*, and it is more than likely they are all astray. Festus ignores etymology when he equates *praevericari* and *praetergredi*: *Praevericatores a praetergrediendo sunt vocitati* (Harper s. v.); the younger Pliny likewise fails to hit the mark with *praeteritio*: *Praevericatio est transire dicenda; pr. etiam cursim et breviter attingere quae sunt inculcanda, infigenda, repetenda* (Ep. 1, 20, 2); Cicero's definition ranks even lower since he fails to account either for the prefix or for the difference of quantity between *v̄rus* and *v̄rius*: *Praevericator significat eum qui in contrariis causis quasi varie esse positus videatur* (Part. Or. 36, 126).

The statement of the lexicons, that 'ploughing a crooked furrow' is the primitive idea, seems to depend upon the elder Pliny: *Arator, nisi incurvus, praevericatur. Inde tralatum hoc crimen in forum. Ibi utique caveatur ubi inventum est* (xviii 10, 49, 179). Yet this passage hardly puts the accepted interpretation beyond doubt. In the ancient writers on agriculture we have as yet failed to find trace of the modern fad of the straight furrow. What Columella insists upon is the necessity of walking in the furrow: *Bubulcum per prescisum ingredi oportet* (2, 2, 25). Pliny may then mean to say: 'The plowman, unless he bends over the plow, cannot walk in the furrow.' As for the enlightening statement that the word was invented in the field and transferred to the forum, two reasons appear for thinking this incorrect, first, the prefix and, second, the deponent form. The rustic term was probably the active verb *varicare*, to straddle, to walk with the feet wide apart, comparable to *claudicare*, to walk with a limp. Both *varicare* and *varus*, the opposite of 'bow-legged', are fairly common: Quintilian says that to walk so is vulgar and disgusting (Inst. 11, 3, 125); Horace explains by *varus* the phrase *distortis cruribus* (Sat. 1, 3, 47); and Varro says of the

legs of dogs cruribus rectis et potius varis quam vatis (R. R. 2, 9, 4); and an A-shaped carpenter's truss is called *vara*.

Pliny does, of course, give us the clue. Some shrewd old farmer like Cato, vir bonus peritus dicendi, who would leave his villa of a spring morning to defend a friend before the praetor in a neighboring town, must have coined the term, with a just appreciation of the force of the prefix and the deponent form to stigmatize a course of duplicity deliberately entered upon. The prevaricator is one who by previous arrangement proceeds to 'straddle' the case and coöperate with his adversary. The real lawyers knew very well that the term signified straddling, or rather forestraddling: Qui *praevaricatur ex utraque parte consistit* (Dig. 47, 15, 1; cf. 3, 2, 4).

Confirmatory evidence of the prominence given in Roman thought to the necessity of walking in the furrow is afforded by the words *delirare* and *delirium*, and here it is Pliny again who tells that they denote a straying from the furrow (*lira*) (xviii 20, 49, 180). Note the active *delirare*, like *varicare* and *claudicare*, of an unconscious or involuntary fault as compared with the deponent *praevaricari*, deliberate wrongdoing. The latter belongs to characterizing deponents like *morari* loaf, and *grassari* swagger.

At the same time it may be noted that *lira* probably denoted the line or groove in the plank used with the plumb-line to ascertain the perpendicular. Hence Ausonius: nil ut deliret amussis (Idyll. 16, 11; also in Oxford text of Appendix Vergiliana, Vir Bonus). The plumb-line must have been extremely familiar to a nation so much given to building and engineering as the Romans; it figured as a symbol of Neces-sitas (Mau-Kelsey Pompeii, p. 391), as also to the Hebrews (Amos 7, 7 ff.). We are rather inclined to think that to many people *delirare* may have meant 'out of plumb', but Pliny's assertion of the rustic connotation cannot be gainsaid, and both may have had currency. However this may be, there can be little doubt that 'to prevaricate' is 'to straddle beforehand'.

NORMAN W. DE WITT.

VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A. MEILLET, *Caractères généraux des Langues Germaniques*.
Librairie Hachette et Cie, Paris 1917. (XVI+222 pp.,
fr. 3, 50).

At various occasions Professor Meillet has given proof of his ability to make the results of comparative philology accessible, in an attractive form, to the public at large.¹ He is, moreover, known to us as an independent scholar, able to contribute new ideas to the subjects chosen. It is accordingly with considerable interest that we take up this little volume.

Judging from the title we might expect a general characterization of the Germanic languages, and, to a certain extent, the scope of the work bears out our expectations. But in attempting to define the general—or we might just as well say, the special—character of the Germanic languages, the author has laid stress primarily on those features in which the Germanic languages show a departure from Indo-European. This is, of course, quite a legitimate proceeding. Yet, if carried on in a one-sided manner, this method may easily lead to a wrong impression, on the part of the reader, as to the character and development of the languages concerned. And I could hardly say that the author has entirely succeeded in avoiding this danger. Upon learning in the course of every chapter how thoroughly the Germanic languages differ from the Indo-Eur. mother tongue, and how the material inherited from I.-Eur. has been used to build up something entirely strange to I.-European, we cannot help getting the impression that the Germanic languages are, in this respect, exceptionally hard sinners, perhaps more so than any other branch of Indo-European.

The author, to be sure, is here and there ready to admit that similar changes may be observed elsewhere in I.-Eur. He, moreover, states expressly that Primitive Germanic had preserved a good many ancient features. At the same time he takes a rather negative attitude toward the Modern Germanic languages, above all toward Modern English. With regard to the latter he sums up his results in the following remarkable statement (p. 217) : "En anglais, la prononciation est émi-

¹ I have in mind, among others, his excellent article : *Les nouvelles langues indo-européennes trouvées en Asie centrale*, in the *Revue du Mois*, vol. XIV (Paris, F. Alcan, 1912), pp. 135-152.

nemment singulière, la grammaire est d'un type qui est le plus loin possible du type indo-européen, et le vocabulaire ne laisse presque plus apparaître que bien peu de termes anciens avec leur sens ancien. A l'indo-européen, l'anglais est lié par une continuité historique; mais il n'a presque rien gardé du fonds indo-européen." This verdict is in keeping with a passage found in the introductory chapter (p. 17): "Rien n'est plus éloigné du type indo-européen que l'anglais—ou le danois—d'aujourd'hui. Si l'on devait, en considérant l'anglais actuel et en oubliant tout le passé, démontrer que l'anglais est une langue indo-européenne, on n'y parviendrait pas." But is the case of the English language really so hopeless, as it appears to Prof. Meillet? Let us for a moment suppose that nothing was known of the previous history of Modern English, and that no trace of any other Germanic language had been preserved. Let us further suppose that our knowledge of Modern English was confined to the numerals from *one* to *ten*, to the words of relationship, *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *son*, *daughter*, and to the pronominal forms *I*, *me*, *thou*, *thee*. I have no doubt that these few words would be quite sufficient to prove conclusively that English is an Indo-European language. These very words, moreover, might be used in support of the contention that in certain respects Modern English has kept nearer to the I.-Eur. foundation than any of the Romance languages or even Latin. Or does the fact that the I.-Eur. words *sūnū-s* 'son' and *dhugh'tér* 'daughter' have been preserved in English, while in Latin (and the Romance languages) we find in their stead the new words *filius* and *filia* (Fr. *fils*, *fille*), admit of any other conclusion?

Similar instances are by no means rare. In numerous verbs (e. g. *sing*, *sang*, *sung*; *speak*, *spoke*, *spoken*; *bear*, *bore*, *born*, etc.) English to this day uses ablaut forms, inherited directly—though not, of course, without phonetic or analogical modifications—from Indo-European. In the Romance languages there is hardly any trace left of the I.-Eur. ablaut, and even in Latin the tendency to eliminate the I.-Eur. ablaut—or at best, to restrict it to an exchange of vowels differing only in quantity—is quite obvious.

Not only with regard to Modern English but with regard to the Germanic languages generally the author maintains that, as compared with ancient Indo-European, they represent a new linguistic type. He sets out (p. 18) by stating that the development of the Germanic group has consisted of departing more and more from the I.-Eur. type, up to the point where, as in English or in Danish, almost every trace of this type has disappeared, and where we are confronted with a new linguistic type. Again and again (e. g., pp. 40, 74, 119, 130), Prof. M.

calls our attention to this alleged state of affairs. In a certain sense and to a certain extent we might agree with him, i. e., with the understanding that the same holds true of every other group of the I.-Eur. family, be it Indo-Iranian, or Armenian, or Latin and the Romance languages, Celtic, Slavic, etc. But this is not what the author wants to make out. He goes on calling our attention to the fact that the ancient Teutons were conquerors (e. g., pp. 5. 6. 9. 13. 19. 21. 22). No doubt they were. But no doubt either that in this respect again the character of the Teutons is in keeping with that of the Indo-European races generally. Or were the Indo-Europeans who, starting from the Punjab, subjected to their rule the larger part of the East Indian peninsula, were the ancient Greeks, the Romans, the Gauls anything else than conquerors? Strangely enough, the author does not seem to regard the conquering habit as an essential quality with regard to linguistic conditions except in case of the Teutons. As regards the latter, he proceeds to establish a connection between their departure from the ancient I.-Eur. type and their character as a conquering race. Obviously the theory advocated by Dr. Feist in various articles and books (e. g., *Indogermanen und Germanen*. Halle 1914) has appealed to him. With Feist he is ready to assume that the Germanic group does not represent a strictly I.-Eur. type. With him he maintains that features characteristic of this group were inherited from the language of a non-Indo-European race which yielded to the Teuton conquerors.¹

The chief argument adduced in favor of this theory is the shifting of consonants in Germanic commonly known as 'Grimm's law.' In Prof. Meillet's words (p. 39 seq.): "Un changement qui, comme la mutation consonantique du germanique et de l'arménien, consiste en un changement profond du procédé articulatoire, et en particulier de l'activité de la glotte dont le sujet parlant n'a pas conscience, s'explique naturellement par le fait² qu'une population, en changeant de langue, a

¹ I do not quite succeed in suppressing my doubts with regard to an essential point in the line of argument adopted by Feist and Meillet. On the one hand, we are impressed by the fact that the Teutons were conquerors, and on the other, we are supposed to believe that their language is that of a conquered race, preserving certain characteristic features of the non-Indo-Eur. language spoken previously by this race. Must we assume then that the conquerors have adopted the phonetic habits of the race over which they extended their dominion whereas the latter, on its part, acquired the militant character of the victor? Meillet, to be sure, states (p. 19): "Les conquérants qui ont apporté l'indo-européen n'ont pas été assez nombreux ni assez puissants pour imposer leur manière d'articuler; les gens qu'ils ont conquis, et qui avaient adopté leur langue ont gardé et ont fait prévaloir leur type articulatoire." I am not certain, however, that this explanation is sufficient to remove the contradiction.

² It will be noticed that the *fait* here designates a *supposed* fact, i. e., a theory.

gardé ses vieilles habitudes articulatoires: la façon de prononcer les occlusives est l'un des faits de prononciation qu'il est le plus mal-aisé de changer." Prof. Meillet here takes it for granted that the 'more precise' pronunciation of the explosives (or 'mutes')—as found e. g. in the Romance and the Slavic languages¹—represents the ancient I.-Eur. type and that the Germanic pronunciation is a later substitute for this type, due to the influence of a non-I.-Eur. language.

He has to admit, however (p. 40), that as far as the Germanic languages are concerned the foreign influence is merely a matter of theory. All he can say in favor of this theory is that a similar development is "indicated by positive facts" for the Armenian language. But even in the case of the Armenian the evidence, as far as I can see, is confined to the fact that the Armenian consonant system is identical with that of the neighboring Caucasian languages. This fact probably admits of more than one explanation.² But even if we had to accept for the Armenian the theory advocated by Prof. Meillet, this would hardly be a sufficient reason for ascribing the Germanic shifting to the influence of a non-Indo-Eur. language.

Nor can I admit that the Romance pronunciation of the explosives has a claim to be regarded as the only genuine I.-Eur. type. Unfortunately we are not in a position to ascertain the exact pronunciation of these consonants in languages like Sanskrit, Old Iranian, ancient Greek and Latin. The field of observation concerning the part played in the method of articulation by the glottis, is essentially confined to the living I.-Eur. languages. Comparing, therefore, the two pronunciations from a merely phonetic point of view, I am inclined to regard the pronunciation with open glottis as the earlier of the two types. The closure of the glottis is necessary for the pronunciation of the vowel following the explosive, but not necessary for the pronunciation of the explosive itself. The closure, accordingly, may be looked at as anticipating the articulation of the follow-

¹ The description of the Slavic and Romance type given by Meillet (p. 36 ff.) is perhaps not quite identical with that found, e. g., in Sievers' *Phonetik* (§§ 364 and 365) or Jespersen's *Lehrbuch der Phonetik* (§ 101). The difference, however, being of little consequence for the present discussion, I shall regard here Meillet's conception as correct.

² Similar to the manner in which modes of dress are found spreading from place to place and from country to country, phonetic habits may migrate from one language to another. A well known instance of this kind is the adoption in German from French of the uvular (in place of the dental) *r* (cp. especially Trautmann, *Die Sprachlaute*, Bonn, 1884-86, p. 294 ff.). If we take into account that the Georgian system of articulation is shared not only by the Armenian but also by the Ossetic language and (according to Schleicher, *Die Sprachen Europas*, Bonn, 1850, p. 27) by certain Tartaric tribes of the Caucasus, the most natural explanation appears to be that in the vicinity of the Caucasus certain fashions of articulation spread—probably at an early date—from tribe to tribe.

ing vowel. If this explanation be correct we may say that the relation between the Germanic type of explosives (the articulation of the explosive unaffected by that of the following vowel) and the Romance type (the glottis contracted for the pronunciation of the vowel during the articulation of the preceding explosive) compares with the difference between a guttural unaffected by the following palatal vowel and a palatal substituted for a former guttural before a palatal vowel. Is it a mere matter of chance then that in both the Romance and Slavic languages the influence of palatal vowels on preceding gutturals (and in languages like Russian even on preceding dentals) is observed in a large measure, whereas most of the Germanic languages hardly show any trace of it?

As stated above, the way in which Prof. Meillet endeavors to explain the facts of the Germanic shifting, is essentially identical with the one suggested by Dr. Feist. We may call this the 'ethnological' or 'ethnographical' theory.¹ There is another theory which may be distinguished from the preceding one by the term 'geographical' theory. Its chief advocate is Heinrich Meyer-Benfey in his important article "Über den Ursprung der Germanischen Lautverschiebung" in *Zeitschr. f. dt. Altertum*, vol. 45 (1901), pp. 101–128. Meyer points out that consonant shifting (in the manner of Grimm's law) is chiefly found in mountain regions. The connection between mountain region and shifting is most obvious in the second Germanic or Old High German shifting. As was shown long ago by W. Braune in his well known article "Zur Kenntnis des Fränkischen" (P. Br. Beitr. Vol. 1, p. 1–56), the second shifting started from the Alpine regions in Southern Germany. Here we find it both in the southern Bavarian and the southern Alemannic dialect, in its full force. After leaving the regions of the high mountains it gradually decreases in strength. Already in the northern Bavarian and the northern Alemannic dialect, its effects are less pronounced than in the extreme South. Yet it keeps on extending, with steadily diminishing energy, over part of the area of the Franconian dialects. Traces of the shifting are still to be found as far north as Cologne and its surroundings. But, in this vicinity, having

¹ The originator of the ethnological theory, not with regard to Grimm's law but especially with regard to certain phonetic features of the French language (which he explained as an inheritance from ancient Celtic) is, to my knowledge, the late Italian scholar G. I. Ascoli. See especially his paper: "Ueber die ethnologischen Gründe der Umgestaltung der Sprachen", in the *Verhandlungen des 5. internat. Or.-Kongresses*, II, 2, Berlin, 1882, pp. 279–286; and his *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe*, übersetzt v. B. Güterbock, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 15–56 (the latter a translation of an article published originally in the *Rivista di Filologia* in 1881).

reached the plains of Northern Germany, the movement stops.¹ Special stress is to be laid on this second Germanic shifting, because it is taking place as it were before our very eyes and under historical and ethnographic conditions which on the whole are within the range of our knowledge. It will be easily seen, however, that this theory applies not only to High German, but to languages generally in which a similar shifting is found, e. g. Old and Modern Armenian, the Soho language in Southern Africa, etc.

However strange it may appear at the first glance that certain consonant changes should depend on geographical surroundings, the connection is easily understood. The change of media to tenuis and that of tenuis to affricate or aspirate are linked together by a common feature, viz. an increase in the intensity of expiration. As the common cause of both these shiftings we may therefore regard a change in the manner in which breath is used for pronunciation. The habitual use of a larger volume of breath means an increased activity of the lungs. Here we have reached the point where the connection with geographical or climatic conditions is clear, because nobody will deny that residence in the mountains, especially in the high mountains, stimulates the lungs.

An additional remark seems in place with regard to Grimm's law. Says Mr. Meillet (p. 30) : "La découverte de ce grand fait [i. e., the Germanic shifting] a été publiée en 1818 par le Danois Rask, en 1822 par l'Allemand Jacob Grimm; le principe a été souvent nommé 'loi de Grimm.'" This statement reads as if Grimm in 1822 had published a discovery made public in 1818 by Rask. If Prof. Meillet had looked up the preface to the second edition of the first volume of Grimm's grammar, published in 1822, he would have found that Grimm there called attention to Rask's work on the origin of the Old Icelandic language and acknowledged his obligation to him with regard to the law of the shifting. He had good reason, however, for not making Rask responsible for the discovery of his (i. e., Grimm's) law. No doubt, Rask had recognized most of the fundamental facts in the first Germanic shifting, and it is proper that the name of the great Danish scholar should be mentioned (as it was mentioned by Grimm) in this connection. Rask's observations, however, are confined to the first Germanic shifting. They took the form of statements concerning the sounds that in most cases correspond in Greek, Latin, etc. to certain Germanic (or, in Rask's terminology, 'Gothic') consonants. Applying to Rask's views a more modern termin-

¹The familiar distinction between 'High German' and 'Low German' or 'Plattdeutsch' finds its explanation in the development of the second Germanic shifting.

nology, we may perhaps say that he discovered a number of phonetic laws (altho he does not use this term) connected with the first Germanic shifting. Grimm's discovery, on the other hand, is chiefly based on a comparison between the first (or general Germanic) and the second (or High German) shifting. It is the combination of the results gained from the study of these two periods that suggested to him the idea of an inherent connection between the various processes of the shifting. I.-Eur. *media* is shifted to Germanic *tenuis*, I.-Eur. *tenuis* to Germanic *aspirate*,¹ I.-Eur. *aspirate* to Germanic *media*. And again Germanic *media* to O. H. G. *tenuis*, Germanic *tenuis* to O. H. G. *aspirate*, Germanic *aspirate* to *media*. As compared with I.-European, therefore, High German has undergone a double shifting. A possible third shifting² would mean a return of the consonants to their original (I.-Eur.) condition. The shifting as a whole then may be compared to the movement of a revolving chain, or to the circulation of the blood in the body. The various processes, of which the consonant shifting is made up, were accordingly considered by Grimm as fragments or subdivisions of one great law in which the formula $T : A : M$ ³ may be used to illustrate the shifting (in a single language) of three different groups of consonants and the result of a double or threefold shifting (in three different languages) of a single group of consonants. This great law—not merely a phonetic law in the ordinary sense, but rather a general formula for the combination of various phonetic laws—was unknown to Rask. Its discovery—though undoubtedly suggested by Rask's observations—is entirely due to Grimm's genius.

One point, however, must not be overlooked. As a formula applicable to more than one language Grimm's law will hold good only if we accept the term 'aspirate' in the broad sense in which it is employed by J. Grimm, i. e., so as to include three or four different classes of consonants, viz. 1) unvoiced aspirates 2) perhaps, voiced aspirates⁴ 3) so-called affricates 4) unvoiced spirants. Another restriction is indicated by the fact that chronologically the shifting, in O. H. G., of the Germanic spirants (=Grimm's 'aspirates') to *mediae* is separated

¹ On Grimm's use of the term 'aspirate' see below.

² A threefold shifting, implying the reappearance of the I.-Eur. sound, is actually found in certain instances of 'Verner's law', e. g. the medial *t* of High Ger. *Vater* (Lat. *pater*), *Mutter* (Lat. *matér*).

³ This formula includes the two others $A : M : T$ and $M : T : A$, if we keep in mind that having reached the end we must return to the starting point.

⁴ Cp. with regard to the alleged I.-Eur. voiced aspirates especially the recent article by E. Prokosch: "Die indogerm. *media aspirata*" in Modern Philology XV, 621-628 and XVI, 99-112 (to be continued). Prof. Prokosch in my opinion is right in holding that the alleged voiced aspirates were originally, in all probability, unvoiced spirants.

from the shifting of the Germanic mediae and tenues by a period of several centuries.

Many other facts tend to confirm the impression that the shifting of spirant to media (A: M) takes place independently of that of media to tenuis (M: T) and tenuis to 'aspirate' (T: A). Let us remember, e. g., that in Germanic the shifting A: M is not confined to O. H. G., but is found also in Low German, or rather in all modern Germanic languages except English and Icelandic. Yet in the two latter the old unvoiced spirants have been, to a large extent, replaced by voiced spirants; nor are instances of the shifting A: M unknown to English, e. g., *gold*=Goth. *gulþ* or *wild*=Goth. *wilþeis*. Let us not forget either that a similar change is quite common in Latin: *lingua* (Goth. *tuggð*) = **l'nχvð*, *ambo* = Gr. *ἀμφώ*, *inde* = *ἐνθα*. Similar examples might be quoted from other languages to which Grimm's law does not otherwise apply. The occurrence then of the shifting A: M (to which I would hardly attempt to apply the geographical theory of phonetic change) in combination with M: T and T: A must probably be explained on the general ground that the shifting of unvoiced spirants (through the intermediate stage of voiced spirants) to 'mediae' belongs to the common linguistic changes.

In this and in other respects the interpretation of 'Grimm's law' remains, to this day, problematic. Not that its existence (in the sense of a general formula, applicable also to languages other than Germanic) could reasonably be doubted. Nor would I maintain that the explanation of the shifting, from a strictly phonetic point of view, is more difficult than that of other phonetic changes. It is the ultimate reasons for the shifting and the connection of the various processes covered by the term 'Grimm's law', both with each other and with features not phonetic, that call for additional elucidation.

Many more instances might be mentioned in which I am obliged to differ from the author. But this would mean, in most cases, criticizing not so much Prof. Meillet's views as the current views in Germanic Philology. To distinguish between the two is not always easy, since the author has nowhere stated—and could not have been expected to state, in a book written for the public at large—to what extent he is reproducing current theories or substituting in their place original views of his own. The plan of his work, moreover, has prevented him from offering reasons *in extenso* for his attitude, even in cases where his own suggestions are of considerable interest.

This applies, f. i., to the discussion (p. 156) of the two different types of j-verbs: Goth. *lag-ji-s*, *lag-ji-p* and *sok-ei-s*, *sok-ei-p* or *mikil-ei-s*, *mikil-ei-p*. The Goth. -*ei*=Germanic -*i*—here of the second type is generally regarded as an example of

the general rule that *-ji-* in final syllables is contracted to *i* (=Goth. *ei*) after a long or a dissyllabic stem syllable. Professor Meillet, while admitting that *-ji-* occurs after a short and *-i-* after a long or dissyllabic stem syllable, compares the relation between the two types with that of Lat. *cāpis* to *sāgis* (=Goth. *sōkeis*) and *sepeis*. We have no doubt that the parallel is correct. But the problem is a complicated one, and several questions remain to be settled. In the author's opinion a form like *lagjip* (3d pers. sing.) replaces an earlier type **lagip*.¹ This seems to indicate that at least in the case of *lagjip*: *sōkeip* he would set aside the alleged rule referred to above for the contraction of *-ji-* to *-i-*. Is he willing to deny the validity of this rule also in the inflection of the nominal *ja-* stems (e. g. Goth. *harjis*: *hairdeis*)? The fact that in Germanic the distribution of *-ji-* and *-i-* is regulated by the quantity of the preceding syllable (or, more generally, the condition of the stem syllable), can hardly be denied. What we should like to know is, whether this is a specially Germanic rule or one inherited from an earlier period. "Les deux formes à *-i-* et à *-i-*," says Prof. Meillet, "sont anciennes toutes deux, et le latin les répartit à peu près de même que le germanique." The "à peu près" here must not be overlooked. While in most of the verbs of the Latin fourth conjugation the stem syllable is long, yet verbs with a short stem syllable are by no means rare, e. g., *blatire*, *ferire*, *furire*, *linire*, *com-pedire*, *expedire*, *im-pedire*, *com-perire*, *ex-periri*, *re-perire*, *pavire*, *polire*, *potiri*, *salire*, *sitire*, *venire* (leaving aside polysyllabic verbs like *amicire*, *aperire*, *operire*, *sepelire*, *stabilire*).

The rule then is not so strict in Latin as in Germanic. The Latin and Germanic type in *-i-*, moreover, cannot be separated from the Slavic verbs in *-isi*, the Lithuanian in *-yti*, the Greek denominatives in *ἴω* (Lat. *fini-o*: *fini-s* m.=Gr. *μηνίω*: *μηνί-s*, or *δηρίουμαι*: *δηρίσω*) and the corresponding Old Ind. verbs in *iyá-* (e. g., *kari-yá-ti*, *tavist-yá-ti*, *mahi-yá-ti*, *sakhi-yá-ti*).² From this point of view the problem gains a somewhat different aspect, while the points of contact between Latin and Germanic—on which Prof. Meillet has justly laid stress—appear all the more significant.

¹ Forms of the type **lagis*, **lagip* are found in West Germanic (e. g., O. H. G. *legis*, *legit*), but can hardly be regarded as more ancient than the corresponding Gothic forms in *-jis*, *-jip*. In W. Germanic the three Gothic types *-i-* (e. g., *nim-i-s*), *-ji-* (e. g., *lag-ji-s*), *-ei-* (e. g., *sōk-ei-s*) have been replaced by the single type *-i-*. That Gothic has preserved the older forms would seem obvious. The combination of the three types in West Germanic is apparently due partly to phonetic development, partly to a blending—by analogy—of various endings. Similarly I would regard Lat. *capis* as a product of the two original types *reg-i-s* and **cap-ji-s*.

² For additional verbs of this type in the RV. see Grassmann's dictionary, col. 1733.

The volume is dedicated to the memory of two of the author's former students who fell victims to the international war. The one is Achille Burgun, the other, Robert Gauthiot whose important contributions to Iranian philology and Indo-European linguistics (e. g., in vol. XVII of the *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*) are fresh in our memory and on whom we were accustomed to look as one of the most promising French scholars in the field of comparative philology. I feel certain that the author's grief will be shared by all of us.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

A Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco. By MORICE VANOVERBERGH, Manila, 1917; 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 10+87 (text) (=Vol. V, Part VI of the Publications of the Division of Ethnology of the Bureau of Science, Manila, P. I.).

This is one of a series of monographs on the languages of the Philippine Islands published by the Philippine Bureau of Science, the most important of which, aside from the present publication, are the following, viz.: Otto Scherer, The Nabaloí Dialect (Vol. II, Part II); The Batan Dialect as a Member of the Philippine Group of Languages (Vol. V, Part I); C. E. Conant, F and V in Philippine Languages (Vol. V, Part II); W. C. Clapp, A Vocabulary of the Igorot Language as spoken by the Bontok Igorots (Vol. V, Part III); Margaret P. Waterman, A Vocabulary of Bontok Stems and their Derivatives (Vol. V, Part IV); C. W. Elliott, A Vocabulary and Phrase Book of the Lanao Moro Dialect (Vol. V, Part V); E. C. Christie, The Subanuns of Sindagan Bay (Vol. VI, Part I).

The present work offers a fairly good practical treatment of the elements of the Igorot dialect in question, the exposition of the material being simple and easily followed. Its limitations and imperfections are those which it has in common with most grammars of a practical character, and are fully realized by the author himself, who states in the Introduction that in spite of the imperfect character of the work he feels no hesitation in publishing it that it may be used for comparison with other Igorot dialects, and that it may form a groundwork for further study of this one dialect, concerning which nothing has yet been published. The author promises also, in due course of time, a dictionary and a collection of native songs.

The work is preceded by a very useful note giving the various designations of the Bauco people used by themselves and by the surrounding tribes, and the designations applied to these tribes by the Bauco people.

In Chapter I, "Preliminaries" (=Phonology), the notices of most of the phenomena are quite brief, such important matters as the accent, for example, being dismissed with a comparatively few words, because "although some rules for accent could be made, it is deemed useless, as there would be too many exceptions." The treatment of what the author calls the "hyphen" (=glottal catch), however, is very good. Under the head of reduplication he mentions what might be called a triplicate form, e. g., *dakedakedake* 'very tall' from *dake* 'tall,' a very unusual formation, tho analogons are sometimes found in other languages, e. g., the triple use of קָדָשׁ *qaddōš* 'holy' in Isaiah 6, 3. The final *n* element which is developed between a word ending in a vowel and a following genitive, and also in some other cases, is syntactical and not phonological in character; it undoubtedly belongs to the class of connective particles called "ligazón" by the Spaniards (English ligature).

In Chapter II the definite articles *san* and *nan* are discussed, but no statement is made as to whether there is any difference in their use; from the examples they would seem to be interchangeable. The particle *sin* also appears to be used as article both in the nominative and in other cases, but the difference between it and the usual article *san*, *nan* is not clearly stated. The statements with regard to the use of one case-form for another, p. 21 (349) top, require further testing; they are probably not true exactly as here given. The article *s*, which is used in many Philippine languages before personal names, has this use also in Bauco, but it is employed moreover as ligature.

In Chapter III the noun both simple and derived is discussed with special attention to the various ways of forming the plural. Chapter IV is devoted to the adjective, of which there are a number of different classes, regard being had in each case to the method of forming comparatives and absolute and relative superlatives. Unfortunately no examples of comparative and superlative forms in complete sentences are given.

The treatment of the various pronouns, which follows in Chapter V, is good, tho the rather complicated matter of the demonstrative pronouns and adjectives should have been made clearer.

Chapter VI, on the numerals, is also good, but fractions are not discussed, nor are the constructions of numerals used as adjectives taken up. Here again examples consisting of complete sentences containing the various numeral forms are in almost all cases lacking. Nouns of relationship with prefix *sin*, e. g., *sin-inā* 'mother and child', should have been treated with

other derivative nouns in Chapter III. Besides the usual series of cardinal numbers cognate with those in the other Philippine languages, two additional series of the numerals 1-10, said to be used by children, are given. A similar additional series of cardinals is mentioned by Noceda in his Tagalog Dictionary (*Vocabulario de la lengua tagala*, 3^a ed., Manila, 1860) under article *isain* p. 159 (for some discussion of this series cf. my Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar II, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. XXVIII, 1907, p. 200 n.).

Chapter VII, on the verb, begins with a series of examples illustrating the expression of the ideas "to be" and "to have," but no description of the construction is given. This is followed by a comparatively simple treatment of the verbal system, first a general discussion of forms, tenses, and voices, followed by a discussion, with examples, of the different verbal classes formed by various afformative particles, and by combinations of such particles, tho no attempt is made to exhibit the verbal system as a whole.

Chapters VIII, IX, X, and XI, which treat adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections, consist chiefly of lists of words, but a fairly good discussion, with examples, of some important categories is given, e. g., of the negative and interrogative adverbs, the ligature *ay*, etc.

The book is furnished with a table of contents by the help of which it is possible to find one's way thru the work without difficulty.

Perhaps the chief point in which the book is lacking, lies in the general meagreness of the examples, and the incomplete character of many of those given. Other defects are the absence of any separate treatment of the connective particles or ligatures, of which there are apparently three, viz., *ay*, *si* and *-n*, which are found discussed under various headings (*ay* under conjunctions, *si* under articles, and *-n* under phonology), and the absence of a sufficient discussion of the use of active and passive constructions.

Tho the author is a Belgian missionary, his English is usually clear and simple; occasionally, however, his native idiom leads him astray. On p. 59 (387) and p. 62 (390) top, he has the expression "although some *be* transitive," and on p. 64 (392) in speaking of verbs that denote pretending to be so and so, he calls them verbs that "indicate *feint*."

The work on the whole is a fairly good specimen of its class, and will furnish a welcome addition to the material in hand for the study of Igorot dialects.

FRANK R. BLAKE.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLVI (1918).

Fascicolo I.

Le "Fenicie" di Seneca (1-40). Umberto Moricca concludes his study of this play (see p. 97 of these reports). The Phoenissae, as already stated, was written by Seneca and by Seneca only. It is not the fragment of one or more tragedies; it is a single play, incomplete only in the sense that Seneca never gave it the last touches. His design, as for example, in the case of the Hercules Furens, was to combine and harmonize in a single representation two motives of the Theban legend each one of which had been made the subject of an entire play by the Greek dramatists. Unity of place is broken at v. 363. Seneca, however, does not always observe these laws fixed by tradition. His model was the Phoenissae of Euripides, but he also made use of the Oedipus Rex and Oedipus Coloneus of Sophocles and finally of the Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus.

Il secondo e il terzo libro dell' *Ars Amatoria* (41-77). Concetto Marchesi gives the substance of these two books with running comments. The second book, he rightly thinks, is the most perfect. Marchesi is much impressed by Ovid's story of Icarus. As he well says, Ovid here has related a miracle and a tragedy within the bounds of thirty-five distichs. I may add that I know of no one in all literature who can approach Ovid's ability to tell a great story within small compass. Marchesi thinks that the charming episode of Odysseus and Calypso owes nothing to Philitas. I agree with him. But the question of Philitas like the question of immortality is beyond definite proof in the ordinary sense.

Una citazione Enniana nel "Brutus" di Cicerone (78-80). Remigio Sabbadini discusses at length the famous passage of Ennius relating to Scipio and shows, it seems to me with great probability, that the last line which appears for example in Vahlen as

Flos delibatus populi suadaeque medulla

contains fragments of more than one line and should therefore appear as

*Flos delibatus populi
..... Suadai medulla.*

Emendamenti a Seneca Ep. II 2(14) (81-89). Achille Beltrami discusses the much bemused sentence which in his own edition (Brescia 1916, p. 46) appears, after the MSS, as Non damnatur latro, cum occidit. One other sentence in the same passage he would write as Sed postea videbimus, an sapienti ori opera (or perhaps an sapienti oris opera) perdenda sit. Besides being intelligible this reading has the advantage of being practically the same as that of the MSS.

Per una recensione (90-94). Domenico Bassi, editor of the Collectio tertia of the Herculanean Papyri, the first volume of which has recently appeared, discusses and answers Terzaghi's criticism of the book (Rivista indo-greco-italica I, 362-3).

Curiosità Alliane (95-98). Ettore Stampini returns again to

haec duo dum vixit iuvenes ita rexit amantes,

a line of the inscription, Dis Manibus Alliae Potestatis (Riv. XLI, p. 385 f.), which has already been much discussed. He agrees with Castelli (*Alcune osservazioni giuridiche sull' epitaffio di Allia Potestas, Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere*, XLVII, p. 372) that the line plainly indicates a ménage à trois. For a similar situation compare also CIL. VI. 21200 = *Carmina epigraphica*, 973 B.

Stampini's second note is concerned with

Mansi et infamis

in the same inscription. Here and here only *infamis* seems to have no pejorative sense. It simply means 'obscure', *sine fama*. He reviews the considerable literature on the subject and concludes that *infamis* simply had the value of *sine fama* in the two accepted meanings of *fama*, *i. e.*, without notoriety' and 'without reputation', with all the meanings which are derived from these two fundamental ideas.

Tibulliana (99-107). Ferruccio Calonghi publishes some results of his collation of the Codex Vaticanus 3270 (V) of Tibullus. He succeeds in showing a number of mistakes in the critical apparatus of Baehrens (1878), in clearing up a number of doubtful readings of the first hand (V¹) or of the later hands (V²) and sometimes of discovering the first intention of V¹ under the correction which immediately took place. The article is to be continued.

"Defixiones" Pompeiane (108-111). Remigio Sabbadini takes up one of the tabulae defixionum published by Della Corte in the Notizie degli scavi di antichità XIII, 1916, pp. 304-6. It was found near a Roman tomb in a Samnite-Roman graveyard and consists of two plates of lead which had been

fastened together by two nails. The text which is fairly complete and of considerable interest is given by Sabbadini together with a commentary. The writer, apparently a woman, directs her curses against one Plematius Hostilis and a woman by the name of Vestilia. The motive appears to have been jealousy. Language and forms indicate a period of composition not later than the second century before Christ, in other words, at least a century earlier than the date of the oldest Latin defixio previously discovered.

A proposito di una nuova edizione del "De vita I. Agricolae" di Tacito (112-124). Pietro Ercole, in connection with a quasi-review of Annibaldi's edition of the *Agricola*, discusses the text of the Codex Iesi (E) upon which that edition is founded. This Codex was discovered by Annibaldi himself in 1902-3, and since then of course has been discussed at great length. Ercole gives all the references.

Recensioni (125-130).

Note bibliografiche (131-148).

Cenni necrologici (149-150).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (151-152).

Fascicolo 2.

Pelasgica (153-206). Luigi Pareti supports the Herodotean chronology for the conquest and occupation of Lemnos by Miltiades and his followers in 510 b. c. He then discusses at length the question of the Pelasgi of Lemnos, their stealing of Athenian women at Brauron, the references to the 'Tyrrhenians' of Lemnos and of other eastern regions known as 'Pelasgian', and the date of the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus. His conclusion is that this Hymn is not anterior to the fifth century before Christ, and that it makes no allusion whatever to supposed Tyrrhenians as inhabitants of Lemnos. This removes the only obstacle to his thesis that there never really were any Tyrrhenians in the northern Aegean and that references to them as such are all due to theories of the Pelasgic origin of the Etruscans.

L'uso pleonastico delle congiunzioni copulative latine (207-215). Remigio Sabbadini, apropos of the *Acta Andreae et Mattheai*, a text of the sixth century recently published by Moricca, gives an interesting discussion of what is generally considered pleonastic use of *et*, *que* and *atque* when preceded by a clause, 1) with a gerundive or participle, 2) a temporal clause, 3) a conditional, 4) causal, or 5) comparative clause. This use is frequent in the text referred to and is common enough in late Latin and in Italian. Sabbadini shows, however, that it goes back to Plautus in Latin and to Homer in Greek. Vergil himself makes a large use of it. But except

from the point of view of a late stage in the evolution of syntax, this usage has no right to be called pleonastic or due to anacoluthon. In the majority of cases, as Sabbadini insists, and I think justly, it is based on parataxis or paratactic usage.

Rileggendo l'Agricola (216-225). Luigi Valmaggi takes up a number of questions connected with the interpretation of 1, 15; 5, 11; 10, 1; 11, 6; 21, 4; 21, 11; 24, 1; 33, 2; 36, 11; and 46, 21. The references are by page and line to Annibaldi's edition.

Tibulliana (226-240). Ferruccio Calonghi concludes his article beginning on p. 99 above.

Salviano e la data del De Gubernatione Dei (241-255). Umberto Moricca. Genseric extended his dominion into Africa in 455 and conquered Sardinia in 461. Salvianus shows his thorough acquaintance with both these events. It follows, therefore, that his *De Gubernatione Dei* could not have been composed prior to 461. This is Moricca's simple settlement of a question which has been much discussed.

Socrate o Platone? (256-271). Adolfo Levi reviews and discusses Burnet's Greek Philosophy, Part I: Thales to Plato (London, 1914).

Recensioni (272-289).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (290-301).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (302-304).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

HERMES XLIX (1914), 3 and 4.

Die Hirten auf dem Felde (321-351). J. Geffcken analyses Vergil's Fourth Eclogue to show that, like the adoration of the shepherds in the Mithras legend, it constitutes a parallel to Luke II 8 f. He shows that Vergil depended on Poseidonius, who combined the Mithras legend with Stoic Philosophy, and he believes that P. also influenced the Evangelist.

Der Ursprung der Diktatur (352-368). W. Soltau sifts the evidence produced by F. Bandel and Rosenberg, and shows that the Roman magister populi (also called dictator after the chief official of the Latins) was appointed during the first 150 years of the Republic as military commander on such occasions when the Romans were joined by their Latin allies. The political importance of this office ceased with the end of the Samnite wars. The last important instance of this office occurred 287 B. C.

Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Biographien Plutarchs (369–381). Cl. Lindskog finds traces of the early tradition of Plut. in passages of Polyaenus and Diogenes Laertius. He recommends a judicious eclecticism in determining the text.

Zu dem Menanderpapyrus in Kairo (382–432). Chr. Jensen publishes the results of his re-examination of this papyrus.

Das Oxyrhynchosblatt der Epitrepones (433–446). With the aid of a parchment fragm. of the IV century (Oxyrh. Pap. X) C. Robert reconstitutes some scenes of the Epitrepones, especially vv. 502 ff.

Der Feldzugsbericht des Ptolemaios Euergetes (447–453). U.von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff discusses the papyrus account of the Syrian campaign of Ptolemy III (cf. Wilcken's Chrestomathy), which has received light from the discovery of the last column. Ptolemy himself refers to Berenice in the words: εἰσήλθαμεν πρὸς τὴν ἀδελφήν. The relations of Theos to Berenice and Laodice are considered.

Eine vergessene Horazemendation (epod. IV, 16) (454–463). F. Jacoby proposes for Othone contempto, O. contento, which is the reading of the Venice and Milan editions of 1478 and 1477 resp., and defends this nominal abl. abs. against Leo's objection that it would give merely an accessory meaning, a 'late' usage.

Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Senecas Tragödien (464–475). W. Hoffa supplements Düring's conspectus of the MSS of the interpolated A-class with the results of observations made in Italy and Paris, and discusses a number of passages in the Hercules [Furens] and the Troades.

Miscellen: Th. Nöldeke (476–478) defends the spiritus lenis in 'Αγβάταν against G. Hüsing who curiously regards this 'distortion' of the Iranian name in Wilam. Moel. Timotheos as an example of spitefulness of Greek philologists towards everything Persian.—F. W. Hall (478) cites a passage from an Oxford MS, which explains a medieval interpolation after v. 411 of Ovid's Metam. XV (ed. Hugo Magnus).—M. Wellmann (478) emends ἀφρός in Philumenus c. 4, 14 (9, 2 W.) to ἀνθρώπος.—F. Bechtel (479) emends Ἀγγενίδας in Xen. Hell. II 3, 10 to Ἀγγελίδας.—G. Wissowa (479–480) considers the eight lines beginning Horace's Sat. I 10 as genuine; but proposes v. 5 multum puerum = 'many a lad'.—O. Kern (480) finds that according to the best MSS of the Orphic hymn-book Hipta or Ipta, not Hippa, is the name of the nurse of Sabazius-Bacchus in XLVIII and XLIX.

Anacreontea (481–507). T. Kehrhahn discusses the metrical structure of the first two poems of Anacreon, with especial regard to Hephaestion (p. 68 Consbruch), and concludes that both are fragments. The verses in both were arranged:

3+5+3. Anacreon's poems seem to have been published in five books, and, perhaps, were arranged as Bergk thought: Glyconics, Ionics, Iambics, Trochaics, Elegies, Epigrams. The evidence for the occurrence of Aeolic forms vanishes under a critical examination.

Vergil und Karthago, Dido und Anna (508-537). H. Dessau describes interestingly the growth of the Aeneid in Vergil's mind. The Dido romance is Vergil's own. He quotes with approval Claudio Donatus interpr. Verg. I, p. 6, ed. Georgii.

Untersuchungen zur Quellengeschichte der Kaiser Aurelian bis auf Constantius (538-580). H. Silomon gives an elaborate discussion of the sources for this period. The de mortibus persecutorum was written in the time of Julian and as a warning to him (cf. A. J. P. XXXVII 363).

ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ Η ΑΝΟΥΠΑΤΟΣ (581-589). M. Holleaux shows from inscriptions that the governor of Macedonia bore the title *στρατηγός ἀνθύπατος Ρωμαῖων*. The inserted *η* of the senatus consultum of the year 112 B. C. is a recognition of the customary abbreviation, the Greeks using the first, the Romans the second term.

Die Rechtsfrage bei der Adoption Hadrians (590-601). St. Brassloff accepts the account of Marius Maximus stating that Trajan, while on his deathbed at Selinus, Cilicia, adopted Hadrian as his successor. The sensational story of Plotina's intrigue (Cassius Dio LXX, 1, 1) is incredible. Trajan acted in accordance with the ius commune.

Zu Ciceros Philippischen Reden (602-611). K. Busche emends fourteen passages.

Apuleiusfragmente (612-620). P. Lehmann publishes fragments of the de herbarum virtutibus found in Berlin and Hildesheim, which may be dated about 700 A. D. They are probably parts of one MS.

Miscellen: W. Gemoll (621-623) offers emendations to Seneca's Epist. Mor.—Fr. Petersen (623-626) restores the British Museum fragments 22 and 60 of the Hypsiyle.—Geo. Wissowa (626-629) discusses inscriptions of a certain Gaionas, who was proud of the title Cistiber, i. e., one of the Quinqueviri cis Tiberim. The δειπνοκρίτης of one inscription is a synonym, which is proved by the lex Tappula (cf. A. J. P. XXVI 474).—J. Kroll (629-632) shows that Vergil's First Eclogue depended on Horace, epode 16, probably Horace's earliest work.—C. Robert (632-636) emends Eur. Bacch. 242-3, Paus. 1, 24, 7, and Jensen's text of the Perikeiromene (Hermes XLIX 480) and partially restores Oxyrh. Pap. 213.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

BRIEF MENTION.

The close of the Civil War was marked by a 'Gott strafe' hatred on both sides. The vanquished were naturally more bitter than the victors, who spared the conquer ed no humiliation. In these days of real brotherhood sealed by a blood covenant, the memories of those days of defeat, of subjugation, have ceased to flame, though there may be a seed of fire in the bosoms of the few unreconstructed survivors of those days. I have learned to laugh at being cited as a representative of Yankee humour, and yet even Southerners of the younger generation resent the classification of their soldiers as Yanks—synonymous fifty years ago with Huns and Boches of to-day, thanks to Sherman and Sheridan. The vows the men of my time took! No intercourse, business or other, with the hated foe. The Southerner was to wear his hodden gray, he was to have a literature of his own, schoolbooks of his own. No Northern college or university should count among its pupils the children of Confederates. How long did the ban last? Business is business and the resumption of business relations followed hard on the surrender at Appomattox. Southern writers found that they must knock at the doors of Northern editors and Northern publishers, if they were not content with a narrow circle of readers, and after a short time the sons of the alumni of Harvard and of Yale and of Princeton were following in the footsteps of their fathers.

Why this reference in this peaceful Journal to those old, unhappy, far-off things? But those old, unhappy, far-off things have a direct bearing on the studies with which the constituents of the Journal have to do. As for business, that will take care of itself. The 7000 tons of German toys that find no market to-day will be quietly absorbed in less time than the newspapers assume. What concerns American scholars most is their relations to Germany. The childish crusade against the German language may be dismissed as the height of absurdity. It is paralleled by the silliness of that German who proposed to drive the piratical jargon of English into the recesses of the tight little island. But we Americans are idealists, and the Germans as a people have sinned against our ideals and stirred a righteous wrath, which will not subside as soon as the hatred engendered by our Civil War. The ninety-

three professors will be dead and buried and most of them forgotten before American students will flock as they have done in the past to Berlin and Leipzig and Munich. Not content with peaceful penetration which had been eminently successful, the Germans have resorted to rape and murder, arson and pillage in the propagation of their peculiar variety of culture. For two generations German scholarship has dominated the philology of America. The Germans have been our schoolmasters and governors. Our leading scholars, if not trained in Germany, are thoroughly familiar with the German language and German methods. And that despite the insolence and arrogance, the Allesbesserwissenschaft, as I have called it, of the Germans, which showed that even in the republic of letters they could not forget their militarism, so that I have considered it one of my duties as an editor to protest against the servility which accepts a German dictum as gospel (A. J. P. XXXVI 241). Truth is truth. ἀρχὰ μεγάλας ἀπέρας, ὥνασσος' Ἀλάθεια.

But the time will never come when Europe will not have its legitimate fascination for Americans no matter how well equipped our universities may be, however cosmopolitan their equipment may be—and of course France has the first claim. The French have gone to school to Germany. They have learned what the Germans had to teach them and they have bettered that instruction by adding a grace and finish of their own. I have referred more than once to 'la voix du sang' which I seem to hear in my own veins, and I am thankful for what I have inherited from one Pierre La Noue,¹ that blood to which I attribute what little *esprit gaulois* I have shown, but the blood that Americans have shed in France has a trumpet call, and I am heartily in favor of the movement to send our students to French schools and French universities, if it were only for the mastery of the language. My old friend Sylvester used to say that he could kiss himself when he spoke French. Alas! there are many of us who, in like case, would substitute 'kick' for 'kiss', the kick of the 'vache espagnolle'. A word might be said also for the Low Countries. There are many who would rejoice to see the ancient glories of Louvain revived, and there are good scholars in Belgium. Nor have the Dutch universities lost their hold on the Greek scholar. In

¹In like manner, though not in the same spirit, Henry Adams (*Education of Henry Adams*, p. 19) tells of the 'quarter taint of Maryland blood' that infected his 'pure New England strain'. However, with the same proportion of alien blood, the brood of John Quincy Adams *tutti quanti* were less human than I am French.

1853 I was strongly tempted to spend some time in Holland for the advantages that Leyden offered, and the fluent Latin of our Dutch compeers has an old-fashioned charm that appeals to a conservative. What lover of Aristophanes does not enjoy Van Leeuwen's commentary? And it is pleasant to note that the same scholar has put forth a new edition of his important work on the language of the Greek epos: *Enchiridion Dictionis Epicae*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1918.

Shortly after Masqueray's handsome tribute, not to say unconditional surrender, to German Hellenists (A. J. P. XXXV 109), the Great War broke out, and, stirred by national feeling, the leading scholars of France, with one voice, entered their protest against the long domination of the Germans in the domain of the classics. The cry for the degermanization of the French universities found a ready echo in the popular press, and henceforth German scholarship need expect nothing except keen scrutiny, made all the more keen by memories of German arrogance. A distinguished French scholar has recently put forth a counterblast against the pretensions of Friedrich August Wolf to originality, and the *Nouvelles de France*, a popular weekly, devoted several columns to Victor Bérard's *Un mensonge de la science allemande*. Most of Wolf's most telling points were conveyed from French authors, and M. Terret, a Unitarian Homerist, need not have attacked Wolf as a great heresiarch, need not have exulted over his death in the ancient Phocaea as a judgment of God (A. J. P. XX 89). But saturnine Germany swallows her own children. Wolf has long since lost caste as an original genius even among the Germans. Terret and Bérard have both been engaged in the easy task of tilting against a paper screen, to use a figure of Mommsen's. It is an old story that Wolf owed his great reputation to a diligent practice in Latin composition, which made the *Prolegomena* readable—a rare charm in a German of that day. Renan, in a letter to Berthelot (A. J. P. XXVI 361), deplored the waste of time of which his countrymen were guilty in paying so much attention to style. But I have long held that whatever a man has to say ought to be said in as artistic a form as possible. It is only the sharp arrow that penetrates the joints of the harness.

Reuchlin, I believe, made friends with the malodorous rabbi whom he consorted with day and night for the better acquisition of the holy tongue; and as a rule editors are disposed to treat leniently the authors whom they edit. But there are

exceptions. Some years ago, I noted the hard measure dealt to Fronto by Naber, and I must plead guilty to a similar intolerance. When Martin Farquhar Tupper was at the height of his shortlived popularity Thackeray was asked what he thought of Mr. Tupper. 'I do not think of Mr. Tupper at all' was the response, and I am afraid that when I think of Justin Martyr, it is with a yawn or else with a bitter recollection of the Charlottesville bank that engulfed my honorarium for two years' work. In fact, since 1877 I have seldom opened the *Apologies* or the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Still, Justin is a part of my life, if an arid part, and the other day when the British forces occupied Shechem, I remembered that Justin was a native of Flavia Neapolis. The case of Persius is different, though an antipodal correspondent once wrote me that the frivolities of my edition were well calculated to vex the unhappy soul of that 'prig', that 'coxcomb', that 'stuck-up and feeble poetaster'. But that prig, that coxcomb, and the rest, has left us some telling verses, and his characterization of Horace, whom he imitated so often and so ill, is nearer the truth than Swinburne's sneer, or Tyrrell's withering censure.

I. 116 *Omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
Tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit.*

'Circum praecordia ludit' is a happy phrase, and has come back to me over and over again as I beguiled the tedium of a slow convalescence by reading Shorey's edition of the Odes. Of course, it will be said, and justly said, that Horace cannot be understood without a study of his times. But the study is apt to degenerate into such fancies as Mr. Verrall's essay on the *Murena Odes* (A. J. P. VI 497), and when Mr. D'ALTON undertakes in his *Horace and His Age* to reproduce the historical, philosophical and literary background of the Venusian poet, he is in his right, but one could wish that he had shown something of the *vafritia* that characterizes Horace and Mr. D'ALTON's own countryman, Mr. Tyrrell.

Some years ago—to be exact in 1905—I protested against Tennyson's characteristic of Pindar as reported by Palgrave (A. J. P. XXVI, 360) :

'On Pindar < Tennyson > once said, "He is a kind of Australian poet; has long tracts of gravel, with immensely large nuggets imbedded." This was in reference to the obscurity and inequality in the Odes: a hasty judgment, perhaps, on that colossal genius, if his work be closely studied as a whole.' Personal Recollections by F. T. Palgrave, in Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir. By his Son. New York, 1898. Vol. ii, p. 499. On the same page Palgrave speaks of Tennyson's off-hand translation (one evening) of 'Pindar's great picture of the life of Heaven in the second Olympian'.

A lover and understander of Pindar who has no peer in the range of my acquaintance has written to *Brief Mention* questioning the accuracy of Palgrave's report. One could wish for Tennyson's sake that there were no foundation for such an absurd estimate. There are no long stretches of gravel in Pindar. His enumerations of victories were doubtless nominated in the bond and what music he makes of the golden coins. A better comparison is at hand. When I was a student at Bonn (1852-3) there was on exhibition what purported to be a curiosity—no curiosity perhaps to the student of optics. It consisted of a ring of brilliant colors—a series of splotches without any more form than the dabs of paint on an artist's palette. The showman placed in the centre a cylindrical mirror and on its surface behold! a reproduction of Rubens' Descent from the Cross. To the casual student Pindar may present such a ring of brilliant colours. He who owns the proper mirror will see a symmetrical picture. Or again, the ear often holds a confused sound, holds it for days or weeks, and then suddenly the cloud resolves itself and the meaning becomes clear. That again is Pindar. 'Nuggets' is mere nonsense. Nothing can transcend the exquisite polish of P.'s most famous passages and if, as Landor complains in the character of Aspasia's correspondent, there is too much gold in Pindar, the gold is finely wrought. Tennyson may have been familiar with Pindar, and my correspondent calls attention to a stanza in *The Sailor Boy* which seems to be a reflection of the famous speech of Pelops in the first Olympian.

Fool! he answer'd, death is sure
 To those that stay and those that roam,
 But I will never more endure
 To sit with empty hands at home.

*Θαρεῖ δὲ οἵσιν ἀνάγκη, τὰ κέ τις ἀνάνυμον
 γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἔνοι μάτα,
 ἀπάντων καλῶν ἀμμορος,*

an heroic commonplace, which heartened many a fighter since like Sarpedon's¹ speech M 322-325.²

I distrust reminiscences of O. I. 50-2 as evidences of Tennyson's love of Pindar and his familiarity with the poet. At all events I have not been at the pains to hunt up Pindaric echoes in Tennyson—a line of study which I leave to my friend Professor Mustard. I am not much concerned to learn

¹ ὁ πέτον, εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόρδε φυγόντε
 αἰεὶ δὴ μᾶλλοιμεν ἀγήρω τὸν ἀθανάτον τε
 θεοσοθ' οὐτε κεν αὐτὸς ἐνι πρότοισι μαχοίμην
 οὐτε κε σὲ στελλούμεν μάχην ἐς κυδιάτερα κατέ.

² And be it remembered that the Lycians Sarpedon and Glaukos were the Frenchmen of the Iliad.

upon what meat this or that poet fed. Your true master is not a sneak-thief but a freebooter. By the way, in pursuing my favorite study, the study of indexes, I was amused to find that in an age when men learned Homer by heart, the polymath Plutarch quotes more from the first books of the Iliad than from the rest of the Homeric poems. Tennyson resembles Pindar in his exquisite finish, and may have learned something from him in that regard. He embroiders as Pindar embroiders and there is something in the range of his imagery that reminds one of Pindar, but he hasn't the Theban's talons.

Some of the constellations of speech are unaffected by the flood of time, *ἄμμοροι . . . Ὀκεανοῖ*, others have their rising and setting, and these have a peculiar interest for the student of language. Attempts have been made to trace the progress of culture by means of linguistic markers. The craze was in full blast even when I was a student at Bonn, and one of my comrades had to be sent across the river to the insane asylum because of his infatuation with the problems presented by the etymology of 'son' and 'daughter'. Etymology has addled the pates of many scholars since. But the fortune of words will always be a matter of intense interest to the heirs of Cratylus. No *λόγος*, no *νόμος* in Homer. What does that mean? *λόγος* in Pindar has to be watched—his *νόμος τύπαννος* is hardly the same as Plato's use of it. Some years ago I encountered an unusual word—a word not to be found in the ordinary dictionaries. I came across it in a French novel of the psychological school—syndérèse, a corruption of *συντήρησις*, the father confessor's equivalent for remorse of conscience. It is based on the familiar effect of introspection, the 'look out not in' of Edward Everett Hale's famous list of 'looks'. I was interested to find the word cropping up in the latest French dictionary—an indication perhaps of the popularity of the psychological novel. It is perhaps also worthy of mention as indicative of churchly influence that Italian and Spanish dictionaries of small pretensions have retained the word. By the way, Hale's 'looks' may possibly be due to a hint in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre* II, i: 'Die jüngsten legten die Arme kreuzweis über die Brust und blickten fröhlich gen Himmel, die mittlern hielten die Arme auf den Rücken und schauten lächelnd zur Erde, die dritten standen strack und mutig; die Arme niedergesenk, wendeten sie den Kopf nach der rechten Seite'. The symbolism is afterwards elaborately explained. The first position teaches Ehrfurcht vor dem, was über uns ist; the second, Ehrfurcht vor dem, was unter uns ist; the third position, which is gained as soon as possible, teaches the pupil the obligation of common action with his comrades.

Untoward conditions, unnecessary to specify, made it impossible for me to furnish the usual batch of unconsidered trifles to the *Brief Mention* of the last number of the American Journal of Philology, and so it came about that No. 155 is the only one of the long series in which I have had neither part nor lot. As I consider the various articles, my satisfaction is untroubled by the usual repentance of my own contributions, for I am my own severest critic. I welcome also the prophecy of continued life for the Journal after I have withdrawn from the ranks of workers. I have never had any serious concern about the editorial future of the Journal. I have lived too long and seen too many irreparable losses, followed by incalculable gains. οὐδὲ μέν οὐδὲ οἱ ἀρπάχοι τούτων was chanted of Protesilaus.¹ I have never ventured to add νόθεον γέ μέν ἀρπάχον. But the responsibility for the publication is another affair. Jean Paul says somewhere that the longest lesson in the Epistles is the one in which St. Paul accords to himself the necessary praise for what he had done and suffered. And if I were as egotistical as the Apostle to the Gentiles, I should not fail to count among my experiences the many troubles I have had in meeting the financial demands of the Journal. A periodical which addresses itself to a limited range of professionals can hardly hope for enthusiastic support, and as I near the end of things I am confronted with business perplexities incident to the war, and when I put out to sea I do not wish my ears to be assailed by muttered curses of printers and clamorous demands of papermakers as they watch my encounter with my pilot. From this worry I have been set free by the liberal action of the Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University so that, beginning with the fortieth volume, the Johns Hopkins Press will take over the publication of the Journal, which after this number will have the guarantee of perpetuity supplied by a great institution.

CORRIGENDUM.

On page 106, line 18, read 'That God doth effect which you don't expect.'

B. L. G.

¹ B 703 = 726. Verse 703 refers to Protesilaus. Much more apposite to my case is v. 726 which has to do with Philoktetes—a suggestion I owe to Professor MILLER. The Johns Hopkins Hospital may answer for Lemnos, and the bird-bolts of *Brief Mention* for the arrows of Philoktetes.

CORRESPONDENCE.

By the kindness of the editor and of my colleague, Professor Van Hook, I have been privileged to see, in proof, Professor Van Hook's paper in this issue, and to make some comment upon it. That comment shall be brief.

In the third paragraph from the close of his paper Professor Van Hook says: "It is true that in the Antigone the motif occurs most frequently, now in one sense, now in another. But this is what one might expect in a play where there is contention and clashing of wills and purposes throughout: first, between Antigone and Ismene; secondly, between Antigone and Creon; thirdly, between Creon and Haemon; and fourthly, between Creon and Teiresias". I am impelled to ask, why, then, was it left for me (as I think it was) to call attention to the presence in the Antigone of this motif? I have read a good deal, in commentaries and elsewhere, on the play, but nowhere have I seen any hint of the recognition of the presence of this motif in the play. I showed clearly in my paper that, discerning as Jebb was, he was wholly blind to this important element of the play.

Had, then, my colleague more clearly emphasized the importance, from this point of view, of my paper, I should have no ground whatever for taking issue with his article. To be the first to note—or at least adequately to emphasize—so important a point in connection with the much studied Antigone, and to inspire so good a paper as Professor Van Hook's, is happiness enough for one who has never professed to be a Grecian.

I am not surprised that, on page 393, note 2, Professor Van Hook maintains that I have overemphasized the significance of certain passages. One is apt to find what he looks for; I am, frankly, surprised that my colleague in so few instances questions my interpretations.

I find myself able, also to agree with what he says of Antigone, in note 2 to page 394. I see now that I was, perhaps, not as clear as I might have been in my paper. To my saying that to Sophocles Antigone was wholly in the right, Creon wholly in the wrong, I should have added a clear-cut statement to the effect that I limited the saying to the intellectual (and moral) issue that lay between them. I did not touch the matters that Professor Van Hook puts so well in the footnote under consideration. I was, in a sense, not concerned at all

with those matters. Antigone was and is a tragic figure of the sort that life supplies often enough to our contemplation—the figure of one rationally and intellectually right, but wrong, most pitifully wrong, in the manner of defending the intellectually right.

It appears, then, that, with the single exception that, perhaps, I overplayed my hand, my distinguished colleague and I are in hearty accord on an important and interesting point in connection with Greek tragedy.

CHARLES KNAPP.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

December 6, 1862—December 6, 1918.

As this number goes to press, word is received of the sudden death of one of our most valued contributors, Kirby Flower Smith, Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University. His death is a grievous blow to the cause of classical learning. A host of friends and admirers mourn his loss. But, in the words of one of his favorite poets,

Sunt aliquid Manes: letum non omnia finit.

A more adequate tribute to his life and services is promised for a future issue of this Journal.

C. W. E. MILLER.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Barker (Ernest). Greek political theory: Plato and his predecessors. *Methuen*. 14s. net.

Bennett (C. E.) New Latin grammar. *Allyn & Bacon*. \$1.

Byrne (Lee). The syntax of high-school Latin; a co-operative study by fifty collaborators. Rev. ed. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago*. 75 c. net.

Callaway (Morgan, Jr.) Studies in the syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels. (*Hesperia, Studies in English Philology* 5.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*. \$2.25.

Clark (J. Taggart). Lexicological evolution and conceptual progress. (Pubs. in *Modern Philology*, v. 7, no. 4.) *Univ. of California*. Paper, 25 c.

Codrington (Thomas). Roman roads in Britain. 3d ed. *S.P.C.K.* 10s. net.

Erasmus (D.) Epistles. From his earliest letters to his fifty-third year, arranged in order of time. English translations from his correspondence, with a commentary confirming the chronological arrangement and supplying further biographical matter, by F. Morgan Nicholls. Vol. 3. *Longmans*. 18s. net.

Foster (Finley Melville Kendall). English translation from the Greek: a bibliographical survey. (Columbia Univ. studies in English and comparative literature). *Lemcke & Buechner*. \$1.75.

Fowler (W. Warde). Virgil's "Gathering of the clans": being observations on Aeneid VII. 2d ed. rev. *Blackwell*. 4s. 6d.

Harvard studies in classical philology. V. 29. Camb., Mass., *Harvard University*. Bds., \$1.50.

Herford (C. H.) The Poetry of Lucretius: A lecture. Manchester Univ. Pr. *Longmans*. 1s. net.

Kaegi (Adolf). Advanced lessons in Greek. 5th ed. St. Louis, *Herder*. 70 c. net.

Leffingwell (Georgia Williams). Social and private life at Rome in the time of Plautus and Terence. (Columbia University studies in history, economics and public law, v. 81, no. 1). *Longmans*. \$1.25 spec. net.

MacGilton (Alice King). A study of the writings of D. Mariano Jose de Larra, 1809-1837. (Pubs. in modern philology, v. 7, no. 2.) *Univ. of California*. Paper, 50 c.

Mercer (S. Alfr. Browne, D. D.) A Sumero-Babylonian sign list; to which is added an Assyrian sign list; and a catalogue of the numerals, weights and measures used at various periods. (Columbia University Oriental studies, v. 14.) *Lemcke & Buechner*. \$6.

Merrill (W. A.) Notes on Lucretius. (Pubs. in classical philology v. 3, no. 5.) Berkeley, Cal., *Univ. of California*. Paper, 50 c.

Newman (L. I.) and Popper (W.) Studies in Biblical parallelism. (Pubs. in Semitic philology.) *Univ. of California*. Paper, \$4.

Oldfather (W. A.) and others. Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur. Pt. I. (Univ. of Ill. studies in language and literature, v. 4, no. 2.) Urbana, Ill., *Univ. of Ill.* Paper, \$2.

Palladius. The Lausiac history of Palladius. Trans. and ed. by Lowther Clarke. (Translations of Christian Literature, Ser. I, Greek texts.) *S. P. C. K.* 5s. net.

Palmer (Harold E.) The scientific study and teaching of languages. (New world Spanish ser.) Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y., *World Book Co.* \$3.

Royds (T. Fletcher). Virgil and Isaiah; a study of the Pollio; with translations, notes and appendices. *Longmans*. 122 pp., \$1.75.

Sophocles. The fragments of Sophocles; ed. with additional notes from the papers of R. C. Jebb and W. G. Headlam. 3 vols. *Putnam*, 1917. \$13.50 net.

Statius (P. Papinius). Silvae. Recognovit J. S. Phillimore. Editio altera. cr. 8°, 3s. 6d.; interleaved, 6s.; swd., 3s. India paper with "Thebais and Achilleis" recognovit H. W. Garrod, 10s. 6d. (Oxford classical texts.) Oxford, *Clarendon Press*.

Stonecipher (Alvin Harrison Morton). Graeco-Persian names. (Vanderbilt Oriental Series.) *Am. Book Co.* \$1.

Vega Carpio, Lope Felix de. The dramatic art of Lope de Vega; together with La dama boba, ed. from an autograph in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, with notes by Rudolph Schevill. (Pubs. in modern philology, v. 6.) *Univ. of California*. 50 c.

Virgil, Aeneid X. Ed., with introd. and notes, by T. L. Papillon and A. E. Heigh. *Milford*. 9s. 2d.

Whittaker (Thomas). The Neo-Platonists: a study in the History of Hellenism. 2d ed. w. Supplement on the Commentaries of Proclus. *Camb. Univ. Press.* 12s. net.

Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1917. Ed. for Journals Board of the Classical Association by Stephen Gaselee. *Murray*. Swd., 2s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Eboue. Langues Sango, Banda, Baya, Mandjia. (Afrique équatoriale.) Notes grammaticales. Mots groupés d'après le sens. Phrases nouvelles. Vocabulaire. *E. Larose*. In-8°, 10 fr.

Perse. Les Satires de Perse. Texte latin avec un commentaire critique, par Fr. Villeneuve. *Hachette*. In-8°, 7 fr.

ITALIAN.

Atti della r. accademia della Crusca per la lingua d'Italia, anno accademico 1915-1916. Firenze, tip. Galileiana, 1917. 8°, 149 pp., xj.

Balbi (Bartolomeo). Manuale teorico-pratico della lingua giapponese. Parte I. Brescia-Napoli, casa ed. l'estremo Oriente (Napoli, S. Mirate), 1918. 4°, 2 voll. (467 pp.; 421), con prospetto. Unbd., about \$12.

Bevilacqua (Amleto). Vocabolario italiano-amarico. Roma, casa ed. Italiana di C. De Luigi, 1917. 8°, vij pp., col. 346.

Ovidio N. (P.) Tristia; recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit C. Landi. Torino, 16°, 146 pp., 2.50 L.

Pindaro, Odi: testo, versione e commento di L. Cerrato. Genova. 8°, 258 pp., 25 L. Edizione della R. Università di Genova. 400 esemplari.

Plauti (T. M.) Captivi; recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et testimonia adiecit C. Pascal. Torino. 16°, 110 pp., 1.75 L.

Senecae (L. A.) Thyestes; Phaedra. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit H. Moricca. Torino. 16°, 148 pp., 2.50 L. (Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum, moderante C. Pascal, vol. XII.)

Studi romanzì editi a cura di E. Monaci. Roma. 8°, 246 pp., 20 L.

Vergilii (P. M.) Catalepton (Priapea et epigrammata; Maecenas, Priapeum, *Quid hoc novi est*. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et indicem verborum addidit R. Sabbadini. Augusta Taurinorum, I. B. Paravia et Socii, 1917. 16°, XII, 65 pp., 1.25 L.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Calkins (Mary W.) *The Good Man and the Good*. New York, *Macmillan Co.*, 1918. \$1.30.
- Clark (John Taggart). *Lexicological evolution and conceptual progress*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 7, No. 4.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.
- Cooper (Lane). *Two Views of Education*. *Sewanee Review*, July, 1918.
- Teacher and Student. *School and Society*, Vol. VIII, July, 1918.
- Cornish (Beatrice Quijada). Francisco Navarro Villoslada. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 7, No. 1.)
- Densmore (Frances). Teton Sioux Music. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1918. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology, Bulletin 61.
- Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Birth Statistics for the registration area of the United States, 1916. Second annual report. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1918.
- Deutsch (Monroe E.). The death of Lepidus, leader of the revolution of 78 b. c. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 3.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.
- Goad (Caroline). Horace in the English literature of the eighteenth century. (Yale Studies in English LVIII.) Yale University diss. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, Humphrey Milford, 1918.
- Inter-América. A Monthly Magazine. Espaíol: Vol. II, Núm. 3, Septiembre de 1918. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.* Núm. 4, Noviembre de 1918.
- Jewish Quarterly Review. The New Series. Vol. IX, Nos. 1 and 2, July and October, 1918. Philadelphia, Pa. Published by the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.
- Leopold (H. M. R.). De ontwikkeling van het Heidendom in Rome. Rotterdam, *W. L. & J. Brusse*, 1918.
- McGuire (Elizabeth). A Study of the Writings of D. Mariano José de Larra, 1809-1837. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 7, No. 2.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.
- Mercer (Samuel A. B.). A Sumero-Babylonian sign-list. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1918. (Columbia University Oriental Studies, Vol. XIV.)
- Merrill (William A.). Notes on Lucretius. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 3, No. 5.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.
- Notes on the Silvae of Statius, Book I. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 4.)
- Messer (William Stuart). The dream in Homer and Greek tragedy. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1918. (Columbia University Studies in Classical Philology.)

Modern Language Notes. Vol. XXXIII, Nos. 7 and 8, November and December, 1918. Baltimore. *Johns Hopkins Press*.

Moore (Clifford Herschel). Pagan ideas of immortality during the early Christian centuries. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1918. 85 c. net.

Morley (S. Griswold). Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the *Siglo de Oro*. Alarcón and Moreto. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 7, No. 3.)

Mortality Statistics 1916. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sam. L. Rogers, Director. Seventeenth Annual Report. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1918.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXVI, Num. 2 y 3. Marzo-Junio de 1918.

Schevill (Rudolph). The dramatic art of Lope de Vega together with La Dama boba. Edited, from an autograph in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, with notes. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 6.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

Shafer (Robert). The English Ode to 1660. An Essay in Literary History. (Princeton Diss.) *Princeton University Press*, 1918.

Shakespeare (The Yale). Midsummer Night's Dream. Edited by Willard Higley Durham. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1918.

— The Tempest. Edited by Chauncey B. Tinker. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1918.

University of California Publications. Semitic Philology. Vol. I. Nos. 2 and 3. Studies in Biblical Parallelism. Part I. Parallelism in Amos. By Louis I. Newman, Part II. Parallelism in Isaiah, chapters 1-10. By William Popper. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIX.

- Accusative, The *To-Participle* with the, in Latin, 184-192
 Achaea, Province of, 97
Aeneas Tacticus, On, 402-404
 On the *Kesrel* of Jul. Afric., 405-406
Aeneid, growth of, in Vergil's mind, 426
Africanus. See *Julius*.
Agram Etruscan ISS, 328
Allia Poteſtas, Epitaph of, discussed, 422
An-a-, Compound Negative Prefix, in Greek and Indic, 292-305
Anacreon, metres of, 425-6
Anagnorisis, Aristotle's treatment of, 274
Andrelinus, Mustard's (rev.), 209-210
Anth. Pal. XI 34 and *Anth. Lat.* 458, 27-32
Antiphon, Emendations, 218
 Notes on oration I, 328
Apocryphal Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare Holograph, 229-267
Apollo Cult, the Sibyl and the Imperial Theme, 341-366
Apollodorus of Carystos, the *Hecyra* of, 93
Apuleius, *De herbarum virtutibus*, fragments of, 426
Aristophanes, Comic Terminations in, 173-183
 Lys. 185 sq., 217
 Scholia, Origin of, 95
 Schol. Ran. 1491, 213
Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 29 sqq., 216
 Definition of tragedy, 269
 Eth. Nic. III 1, 218
 1100, a, 35, 94
Arnolletus, Mustard's (rev.), 209-210
ARON, ALBERT W. Review of Bloomfield's Introduction to the Study of Language, 86-92
- Asclepiades Myrleanus, workmanship of, 216
 Assimilation and dissimilation of Latin prefixes, 214
 Astrology in Plotinus, 217
 Athenian Constitution, change of, in 411, 216
atque, pleonastic, 423
Auguria salutis, 327
 Augustan Poets, An 'Inspired Message' in the, 341-366
 Augustus' second triumvirate, 328
 Aurelian, Sources of Imperial history from Aurelian to Constantius, 426
Aurelius Victor, Emendations, 96
- BENDER**, HAROLD H. Lithuanian *gaudonė* 'Horse-Fly', 314-315
- BION**, Later Echoes of, 197
- BLAKE**, FRANK R. Review of Vanoverbergh's A Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco, 418-420
- BLONDEHEIM**, D. S. Review of Clédat's Manuel de phonétique et de morphologie historique du Français, 324-325
- Bloomfield's Introduction to the Study of Language (rev.), 86-92
- Boccaccio, Indebtedness of Chaucer to the Italian Works of, 83-86
- Books Received, 115-116; 227-228; 339-340; 439-440
- Brief Mention, 99-107; 220-223; 332-335; 427-433
- Bucolic Poets, Later Echoes of the Greek, 193-198
- Bureau of American Ethnology, Reports and Bulletin of (mentioned), 222-3

- BURLINGAME, EUGENE
WATSON. The Compound
Negative Prefix *an-a-* in
Greek and Indic, 299-305
- Cairo Menander, Reëxamina-
tion of the, 425
- CANTER, H. V. Rhetorical
Elements in Livy's Direct
Speeches. Part II, 44-64
- Oldfather, Pease and Can-
ter's Index verborum to
Seneca (mentioned), 334-335
- Chartes et Diplômes relatifs
à l'Histoire de France
(mentioned), 107
- Chaucer, The Indebtedness
of, to the Italian Works
of Boccaccio, 83-86
- Chaucer's Griselda and Ho-
mer's Arete, 75-78
- Chronology, Delphian, Prob-
lems in, 145-172
- Cicero, Ad Att. XV 9, 1, 312-313
- De Signis 8, 214
- Philippics, textual notes, 426
- Verrines, textual notes, 96
- CIL XIV 2603 and 2608, 217
- Classics, Imitations of,
Value of the, West's (men-
tioned), 105
- Cleédat's Manuel de
phonétique et de morpho-
logie historique du Fran-
çais (rev.), 324-325
- Coislinianus 169 of Theocri-
tus, 94
- COLLITZ, HERMANN. Review
of Meillet's Caractères
généraux des Langues
Germaniques, 409-418
- Coloni, 94
- Comic Terminations in Ar-
istophanes, 173-183
- Compound Negative Prefix
an-a- in Greek and
Indic, 299-305
- Constantius, Sources of Im-
perial history from
Aurelian to, 426
- COOK, ALBERT STANBURROUGH.
Chaucer's Griselda and
Homer's Arete, 75-78
- Correspondence, 108-109; 109-
110; 434-435
- Corrigenda, III; 433
- Cummings' Indebtedness of
Chaucer's Works to the
Italian Works of Boc-
cacio (rev.), 83-86
- Curse tablet, Pompeian, 422-3
- Curse Tablets. See Latin
Curse Tablets.
- D'Alton's Horace and His
Age (mentioned), 106-7; 430
- Date of the Vatinian Law,
The, 367-382
- Dative, Syncretism in the
Indo-European, 1-26; 117-144
- Defixio. See Curse Tablet.
- Delirium, Praevaricatio and,
407-408
- Delphian Chronology, Prob-
lems in, 145-172
- Demosthenes XX, Critical
notes on, 331
- Deponents in Latin dis-
cussed, 187
- DE WITT, NORMAN W. Prae-
varicatio and Delirium,
407-408
- Dictatorship, Origin of, 424
- Dido romance in the Aeneid, 426
- Dionysus, Date of Homeric
Hymn to, 423
- Dissimilation and assimilation
of Latin prefixes, 214
- Dramatic Value of the Recog-
nition Scene in Greek
Tragedy, 268-290
- DUFF, J. WIGHT. Note on the
Opening Words of the
Odyssey of Livius An-
dronicus, 108
- EBELING, HERMANN LOUIS.
Report of Hermes, 215-
219; 326-329; 424-426
- Echoes, Later, of the Greek
Bucolic Poets, 193-198
- Elegiacs of Faustus Andre-
linus and Joannes Arnol-
letus, Mustard's (rev.),
209-210
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Re-
view of Wulff's Den Old-
javanske Wiråtaparwa og
dens Sanskrit-original,
321-324
- Ennius, A passage of, in
Cicero's Brutus, 421
- Epigram of Philodemus and
Two Latin Congeners, 27-43
- Epistolographers, Oaths in
the Greek, 65-74
- Epitrepontes, Oxyrhynchus
fragment of the, 425

- Esdras-Nehemiah, Hesychian and Hexaplar recensions of, 330
Estensis *graecus* 87 of Theocritus, 96
et, pleonastic, 423
Etruscan ISS of Agram, 328
Euripides, Bacch. 242-3
emended, 426
Hypsipyle, notes on, 426
- F**AY, EDWIN W. West Germanic Preterits with *ɛ̄* from IE *ɛi*, 291-298
- FERGUSON, J. F. Review of Husband's The Prosecution of Jesus, 205-209
- Folly, Wisdom versus, The 'Thought' Motif of, in Greek Tragedy, 393-401
- Fork, Use of the, 98
- FRANK, TENNEY. Cicero, Ad Att. XV 9, 1, 312-313
- Function and Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy, 268-290
- goudonē*, 314-315
- Germanic Preterits, West, with *ɛ̄* from IE *ɛi*, 291-298
- GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. Brief Mention, 99-106; 220-221; 427-433
Correspondence, 110
Report of Revue de Philosophie, 93-96; 211-215
- Gortynian law code, 217
- Greece after 146 B. c., 97
- Greek Bucolic Poets, Later Echoes of the, 193-198
- Compound Negative Prefix *an-a-* in, 299-305
relative pronoun, repetition of, 94-95
sacrificial rites, 217
- Tragedy, Recognition Scene in, 268-290
The 'Thought' Motif of Wisdom versus Folly in, 393-401
- words:
'Αγβάταρα, Defence of the smooth breathing in, 425; *διοτι*, 218; *dv-a-*, 299-305; *Αραιτηρ* (= 'Αραιτηρ) for *Δατείνηρ*, 96; *dv-θύτας* 'Ρωμαῖος, 426; *δα-tόμαι*, 203; *δειπνοκρίτης*, 426; *δεύτερος πλοῦς*, 94; *δονήιν*, of seasickness, 105; *εἴτα*, 204; *θλεος*, 268; *Ιτείκα*, 293; *ιερά τέλεια*, 217; *Ιππός*, 217; *Κεροί* of Julius Africanus, On the, 405-406; *μαντηρία*, 105; *περὶ δέσμων*, *ὑδάτων*, *τόπων*, critical notes on the Latin version of, 331; *ποικιλία*, 102; *στρατηγὸς ἡ διαθέτας Ρωμαῖοι*, 426; *τόμα*, 217; *φέβος*, 268.
- G**REEN, ALEXANDER. The Apocryphal Sir Thomas More and the Shakespeare Holograph, 229-267
- Hadrian's adoption, 426
- H**AIGHT, ELIZABETH HAZELTON. An 'Inspired Message' in the Augustan Poets, 341-366
- HAUPT, PAUL. Omoroka and Thalath, 306-311
- Hecabe's dream, 329
- HENDRICKSON, G. L. An Epigram of Philodemus and Two Latin Congeners, 27-43
- Herculanee Papiri, 97; 422
- Hermes, Report of, 215-219; 326-329; 424-426
- Herodorus, FHG. II 34, 218
- Heron of Alexandria, date of, 218
- Hesiod, Pandora myth in, 215
Theogony, Proem of, 215
- Hipta or Ipta, not Hippa, 425
- Homeric Hymn to Dionysus, Date of, 423
- Homer's Arete, Chaucer's Griselda and, 75-78
- Horace and His Age (mentioned), 106-107
- Epop. IV 16, 425
XVI, the pattern of Vergil's Ecl. I, 426
- New Collation of Parisinus 7900 A for the Epistles of, 79-80
- Odes I 38 and Anth. Pal. XI 34, 32-41
Sat. I 10, 1-8, 425
- Humanism at Paris from 1494-1517, 222
- Husband's The Prosecution of Jesus (rev.), 205-209
- Hortensius, Annals of, 326
- IG (ed. min.) II¹, 1, 212
IV 955, 218

- Imperial Theme, The Apollo Cult, the Sibyl and the, 341-366
 Indeterminate subject in Latin, expression of, 211
 Indic, Compound Negative Prefix *an-a* in Greek and, 299-305
 Indirect Discourse, Indicative in, 214
 Inflected languages, Advantages of, 320
 'Inspired Message,' An, in the Augustan Poets, 341-366
 Ipta or Hipta, not Hippa, 425
 Isis Latina emended to Isis *Anætis*, 96
 Litany, edition of the, 95
 104 emended, 96
 Jesus, Prosecution of, Husband's (rev.), 205-209
 JOHNSON, ALLAN CHESTER. Problems in Delphian Chronology, 145-172
 Johnson's Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language (mentioned), 333-4
 Julius Africanus, On the *Kerrol* of, 405-406
 Juvenal's exile, place of, 330
 KENT, ROLAND G. Brief Mention of Johnson's Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language, 332-3
 Stonecipher's Graeco-Persian Names, 333
 Review of Sturtevant's Linguistic Change, 316-321
 KNAPP, CHARLES. Correspondence, 109; 434-5
 KNIGHT, CLARA M. The To-Participle with the Accusative in Latin, 184-192
 Lais, name and its later use discussed, 220
 Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets, 193-198
 Latin, The To-Participle with the Accusative in, 184-192
 copulatives, Pleonastic use of, 423
 curse tablets, Language of, 214; 329; 330; 331
 prefixes, dissimilation and assimilation of, 214
 words: *aidilis lustralis*, 217; 327; *auguria salutis*, 327; *Cistiber*, 426; *delirium*, 407-408; *infamis*, 422; *lectulus*, 214; *lectus*, 214; *lucius*, 331; *magister populi*, 424; *parcepromus versus parcipromus*, 96; *prævaricatio*, 407-408; *probucrunt*, 109-110
 Lemnos, the Pelasgians of, 423
 Leonard's Lucretius (rev.), 81-83
 Lithuanian *gaudone* 'Horse-Fly,' 314-315
 Livius Andronicus, Note on the Opening Words of the *Odyssey* of, 108
 Livy II, 39-40 and Seneca, 97
 Livy's Direct Speeches, Rhetorical Elements in. Part II, 44-64
 Lucilius, supposed fragment of, 331
 Lucretius, Leonard's (rev.), 81-83
 Merrill's (rev.), 223
 Book IV, Emendations, 213
 Luke II 8 sq., Posidonian influence in, 424
 McCREA, NELSON G. Necrology of James Rignall Wheeler, 110-111
 McDANIEL, WALTON BROOKS. Review of Mustard's The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus, 209-210
 Magic, Tavenner's Studies in (rev.), 199-205
 MAGOFFIN, R. V. D. Brief Mention of Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Historie de France, 107
 Annual Reports 29-30, and Bulletin 55 of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 222-3
 Marcus Plautius, Epigram in honor of, 97
 Meillet's Caractères généraux des Langues Germaniques (rev.), 409-418
 Menander, The Cairo, 425
 Menander's Epitrepontes and Terence's *Hecyra*, 93
 Oxyrhynchus fragment of, 425
 Perikeiromene, emendations, 426
 Merrill's Lucretius (mentioned), 223

- More, Sir Thomas, The Apocryphal, and the Shakespeare Holograph, 229-267
- Moschus, Coislinianus 169 of, 94
Later Echoes of, 197-198
- MUSTARD, W. P. Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets, 193-198
- Brief Mention of D'Alton's Horace and His Age, 106-7
Renaudet's *Préreforme et Humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie* (1494-1517), 222
Report of Revue de Philologie, 329-331
- Mustard's The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus (rev.), 209-210
- Necrology of James Rignall Wheeler, 110-111
- Negative Prefix *an-a-* in Greek and Indic, 299-305
- New Collation of Parisinus 7900 A for the Epistles of Horace, 79-80
- Nonnos, Dionysiaca, Critical notes on, 326; 330
VII 100 sqq., 214
- Oaths in the Greek Epistolographers, 65-74
- OLDFATHER, W. A. On Aeneas Tacticus, 402-404
and PEASE, A. S. On the *Kœrol* of Julius Africanus, 405-406
- Oldfather, Pease & Canter's Index verborum of Seneca (mentioned), 334-5
- Ombos, site of, 330
- Omoroka and Thalath, 306-311
- On Aeneas Tacticus, 402-404
- On the *Kœrol* of Julius Africanus, 405-406
- Orphic Hymns XLVIII and XLIX, 425
- Ovid's Ars Amatoria III, 421
banishment, Reason of, 341-366
Metamorphoses XIV, 411,
Interpolation after, 425
- Oxyrh. Pap. 41, 4 emended, 95
213, restored, 426
- Panaitios as a critic, 213
- Pandora myth in Hesiod, 215
- Papyri, Herculanean, 97; 422
Parini's imitations of the classics, 98
- Parisinus 7900 A, New Collation of, for the Epistles of Horace, 79-80
- Participle, The *To-*, with the Accusative in Latin, 184-192
- PATCH, HOWARD R. Review of Cummings' The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, 83-86
- Paulus Silentarius, A. P. VII 220, translated, 221
- Pausanias I 24, 7 emended, 426
VII 16, 9-10, 97
- Pearson's edition of Sophocles' fragments (mentioned), 103-105
- PEASE, ARTHUR STANLEY. On Aeneas Tacticus, 404
and OLDFATHER. On the *Kœrol* of Julius Africanus, 405-406
Oldfather, Pease and Canter's Index verborum to Seneca (mentioned), 334-335
- Pelasgica, 423
- PEPPLER, C. W. Brief Mention of Petersen's Latin Diminution of Adjectives, 333-4
- Comic Terminations in Aristophanes, 173-183
- Perikeironem. See Menander.
- Perrin's Recognition Scenes in Greek Literature discussed, 275
- PETERSEN, WALTER. Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative, 1-26; 117-144
Latin Diminution of Adjectives (mentioned), 333-4
- Phaedrus. See Vindiciae.
- Philodemus, An Epigram of, and Two Latin Congeners, 27-43
Hœpl Marías. 97
- Philumenus IV, 14 (9, 2 W.), emended, 425
- Phoenissæ of Seneca, 97
- Pindar's eighth paean, 329
- Plautine emendations, 95-96
- Plautius, Marcus, Epigram in honor of, 97
- Pleonastic *et, que* and *atque*, 423
- Pliny's travels in Bithynia and Pontus, 217
- Plotinus, Studies in, 217
- Plutarch's Lives, Transmission of, 425
- Poetry, Roman, of the Sullan period, 326

- Pompeian *dexio*, 422
 Porson's law, 327
 Posidonius and Vergil's fourth Eclogue, 424
 POSTGATE, J. P.
 Correspondence, 109-110
 Vindiciae Phaedrianae, 383-392
 Praevericatio and Delirium, 407-408
 Prefixes, Latin, dissimilation and assimilation of, 214
 Preterits, West Germanic, with *ß* from IE *éi*, 291-298
 Problems in Delphian Chronology, 145-172
 Ptolemy Euergetes, Syrian campaign of, 425
que, pleonastic, 423
 Recent Publications, 112-114; 224-226; 336-337; 436-438
 Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy, Function and Dramatic Value of the, 268-290
 Relative pronoun, repetition of, in Greek, 94-95
 Renaudet's *Prériforme et Humanisme* (mentioned), 222
 Reports:
 Hermes, 215-219; 326-329; 424-426
 Revue de Philologie, 93-96; 211-215; 329-331
 Rivista di Filologia, 96-98; 421-424
 Reviews:
 Bloomfield's Introduction to the Study of Language, 86-92
 Clédat's *Manuel de phonétique et de morphologie historique du Français*, 324-325
 Cummings' Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, 83-86
 Husband's The Prosecution of Jesus, 205-209
 Leonard's *Lucretius*, 81-83
 Meillet's *Caractères généraux des Langues Germanniennes*, 409-418
 Mustard's Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus, 209-210
 Sturtevant's Linguistic Change, 316-321
 Tavenner's Studies in Magic from Latin Literature, 199-205
 Vanoverbergh's A Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco, 418-420
 Wulff's *Den Oldjavanske Wiråtparwa og dens Sanskrit-original*, 321-324
Revue de Philologie, Report of, 93-96; 211-215; 329-331
 Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches. Part II, 44-64
 RIESS, ERNST. Review of Tavenner's Studies in Magic from Latin Literature, 199-205
 Rivista di Filologia, Report of, 96-98; 421-424
 Roman Poetry of the Period of Sulla, 326
 Sabazius, name of the nurse of, 425
 Sacrificial rites of the Greeks, 217
 SAGE, EVAN T. The Date of the Vatinian Law, 367-382
 Salvianus' *De gubernatione dei*, Date of, 424
 Sannazaro, Echoes of Greek Bucolic Poets in, 193 sqq.
 Satyros' *βλος Εδριπίδου* fr. 9 Hunt, 218
 Scholia of Aristophanes, Origin of, 95
 Scholia Theocritea, 96
 Seneca, Epist. II 2 (14) emended, 422
 Index verborum, Oldfather, Pease and Canter's (mentioned), 334-335
 Phoenissae, 97; 421
 Textual notes on, 425
 Shakespeare Holograph, The Apocryphal Sir Thomas More and the, 229-267
 Shakespeare's handwriting, 229 sqq.
 Sibyl, Apollo Cult and Imperial Theme, 341-366
 Sir Thomas More, The Apocryphal, and the Shakespeare Holograph, 229-267
 SLAUGHTER, M. S. New Collation of Parisinus 7900 A for the Epistles of Horace, 79-80

- SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER.** Brief Mention of Merrill's Lucretius, 223
Oldfather, Pease and Canter's Index verborum of Seneca's tragedies, 334-5
Obituary notice of, 435
Report of Rivista di Filologia, 96-98; 421-424
Review of Leonard's Lucretius, 81-83
Socrates and Ran. 1491 sqq., 213
Sophokles, Discussed, 99
Pearson's Fragments of (mentioned), 103
Stampini's Post XL Annos, 97
Stonecipher's Graeco-Persian Names (mentioned), 333
STUART, DONALD CLIVE. The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy, 268-290
Sturtevant's Linguistic Change (rev.), 316-321
Subject, indeterminate, expression of, in Latin, 211
Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative, 1-26; 117-144
Tacitus' Agricola, Discussion of the Codex Iesi (E) of, 423
Interpretation of various passages of, 424
Taverner's Studies in Magic from Latin Literature (rev.), 199-205
Terence, Division into acts, 93
Hecyra, the model of, 93
Terminations, Comic, in Aristophanes, 173-183
Thalath, Omoroka and, 306-311
Theocritus, Coislinianus 169 of, 94
Estensis graecus 87 of, 96
Later Echoes of, 193-197
Scholia, 96
'Thought' Motif of Wisdom versus Folly in Greek Tragedy, The, 393-401
Thucydidean account of the revolution of 411, 216
Tibulliana, 422; 424
To-Participle with the Accusative in Latin, The, 184-192
Tusculan sacra, 327
Tragedy, The 'Thought' Motif of Wisdom versus Folly in Greek, 393-401
Valerius Flaccus, Notes on, 212-3
Value of the Classics, West's (mentioned), 105
VAN HOOK, LARUE. The 'Thought' Motif of Wisdom versus Folly in Greek Tragedy, 393-401
Van Leeuwen's Enchiridion Dictionis Epicae (mentioned), 429
Vanoverbergh's A Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco (rev.), 418-420
Varro, R. R., Emendations, 96
Vatinian Law, The Date of the, 367-382
Vergil, Aeneid, Dido romance in, 426
VI 586 sqq., 214
Eclogue I, 426
IV and Posidonius, 424
Essays and Notes on, 211-2; 330
Lejay's Notes on the Syn-tax of (reported), 211-2
Vindiciae Phaedrianae, 383-392
West Germanic Preterits with \bar{E} from IE $\bar{E}i$, 291-298
West's Value of the Classics (mentioned), 105
Wheeler, James Rignall, Necrology of, 110-11
Wisdom versus Folly in Greek Tragedy, The 'Thought' Motif of, 393-401
WRIGHT, F. WARREN. Oaths in the Greek Epistolographers, 65-74
Wulff's Den Oldjavanske Wirāṭaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original (rev.), 321-324

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE

THE VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE.

3 0000 099 671 715